NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

NO. DCXC

MAY, 1913

THE NEEDED CURRENCY REFORM

BY AMOS K. FISKE

Our present national banking and currency system was hastily devised under the financial stress of the Civil War, primarily to sustain the Government in a dire emergency. It was intended to support the public credit by assuring a market for a large volume of Government bonds and supply a national currency to replace the inadequate and largely discredited issues of State banks. This was to consist of notes issued by a new system of banks organized under Federal authority on security of these bonds to more than the full amount, deposited with the Treasurer of the United States. A strong inducement was offered in the high rate of interest on the bonds and relief from the direct obligation to redeem the notes on demand.

The state of public sentiment forbade establishing any central institution like the old United States Banks or copying the plan of the great dominating banks of European nations. The model had to be drawn from the incongruous medley of State banks, and not the best plan among these was selected for the simple reason that it was not best adapted to the immediate purpose. Under a general suspension of specie payments a preliminary step had been taken by an issue of Government legal-tender notes which were to serve as reserve money in the absence of coin. The

Copyright, 1913, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national banking and currency system may almost be said to have been improvised in 1863, by men who were not experts at the task, to meet a financial emergency with which the Government was desperately struggling. It was somewhat improved in the following year, but has undergone only slight modification in its essential features since.

Since it was established there has been a vast industrial and commercial development, with an enormous multiplication of daily transactions in the exchange of values and credits. The use of drafts and checks upon bank deposits as a means of making payments by the transfer of credit from one to another has grown to vast proportions, until from ninety to ninety-five per cent. of business transactions are effected by means of them. The full significance of the use of these orders upon bank deposits as a credit currency is not generally appreciated. It should be understood that the deposits themselves consist only in small part of money, not at all of money which continues to belong to the depositor. They are credits granted by the bank to its depositors and are largely created by loans to them upon their credit satisfactorily secured. Whatever cash may be deposited goes into the funds of the bank and helps to maintain its reserve for meeting demands for cash payments.

Checks in common use are orders upon banks for payments to those in whose favor or to whose order they are drawn, and they effect a transfer of credits from one to another in the same bank or in different banks. They may be paid in money if it is demanded, but for the most part they are received in deposits and simply transfer credit from one to another, the bank assuming the task of collecting from other banks when the checks are not drawn upon itself or its own depositors. Drafts upon persons for money due are handled in a similar way through the banks. The volume of checks and drafts continually flowing into and out of the banks, transferring credits and being exchanged and balanced against accounts, constitute the great bulk of the currency of the country for trade purposes. It passes from hand to hand to only a limited extent by indorsement, and, as coin is hardly used except for small payments, there is need of a convenient "circulating" medium in the form of notes with which ordinary payments may be made. While this requirement is small compared with the volume of transac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions effected by checks and drafts, it is nevertheless of large magnitude and importance. There is need of a considerable volume of convenient currency to pass from hand to hand in the multitude of daily payments. The best form for this is that of circulating notes issued by banks, payable by them in coin on demand, and so secured that they will always be redeemed in actual money whenever the demand is made.

Our present banking system has two chief defects. One is the lack of note issues which can be adjusted by normal expansion and contraction to constantly varying needs. The other, by no means of less importance, is a plan of cash reserves held against deposit liabilities which seems to have been ingeniously devised to cause trouble in time of disturbed confidence. Under the old State system cash reserves, consisting invariably of coined money, were chiefly regarded as a provision for redeeming notes. Deposits were made mostly in bank-notes and paid in the same medium, the genuine notes of all banks being indifferently accepted and paid out. There were no definite reserves held against deposits, and requirements for those kept for the redemption of notes differed in different States, where there were any legal requirements at all.

When the national banking system was established it was required that a certain percentage of "lawful money" be held always at command for the payment of deposits in cash. As there was then a suspension of specie payments and the Government's own notes were a legal tender for the payment of debts, the reserves consisted chiefly, in most of the country wholly, of these notes, or "greenbacks." None of them were held as a means of redeeming the notes of the banks, which were secured by the deposit of Government bonds with the Treasury at Washington and were redeemable only there. A number of reserve cities were designated by name, only sixteen at first for the whole country, but subsequently increased in number from time to time until now there are over forty. New York, Chicago, and St. Louis were designated as Central Reserve Cities, and no additions have been made to these.

All national banks outside of reserve cities were required to have cash reserves equal to fifteen per cent. of their deposits, but they were permitted to keep three-fifths of these on deposit in banks approved by the Secretary of the Treasury in some reserve city, making it unnecessary to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hold more than two-fifths in "lawful money" in their own vaults. Reserve city banks were required to have cash reserves equal to twenty-five per cent. of their deposits, but one-half of these might be kept on deposit in banks in one of the central reserve cities, the other half only being held in their own vaults in "lawful money." Thus three-fifths of the reserves of what are commonly called "country banks," or those outside of reserve cities, might be in the form of mere credits held as deposits in reserve city banks, while half the reserves of the latter might be credits constituting part of the deposits of central reserve city banks, against which their own reserve of twenty-five per cent. was held. Owing to the tendency of exchange operations to New York, as the financial center of the nation, the ultimate resort of reserve money was to that city. This consisted virtually of legal-tender notes of the Government, until the resumption of specie payments in 1879, and provision for the redemption of these notes in coin. Since then they have consisted more and more of coin or gold and silver certificates representing coin deposited with the Treasury to the full amount. Another complication was due to an increasing number of State banks having different reserve requirements, which centered largely upon the "approved reserve agent" banks of the national system.

Of the working of this reserve plan there has been plenty of experience, and it is easy to understand. Since it was established the number of national banks has grown to nearly seventy-five hundred, with an aggregate capital of over a billion dollars and deposits of about six billions, and there are more than twice as many State banks. Each bank in the national system is independent in its operations, except so far as it is made subject to examination and supervision by the Comptroller of the Currency, with a view to enforcing compliance with the law, or it voluntarily submits to the rules of a Clearing House Association in cities where such organizations exist. In ordinary times of confidence and steady business there is no strain upon bank reserves and they are easily kept up to the legal requirements. There is little direct demand for "lawful money" by depositors, and the chief effect of the legal limitation is to put a restraint upon undue extension of loans, which are credited to borrowers as deposits to be drawn upon. That part of country bank reserves on deposit in reserve

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cities and the reserves of reserve city banks on deposit in central reserve cities are kept in use as if belonging to the current funds of the banks in which they are deposited so long as the percentage of final reserve is maintained. In addition, the country banks may have other funds deposited in reserve and central reserve city banks to meet the requirements of exchange or to be loaned out when that can be profitably done.

While all works smoothly in ordinary times, this reserve plan creates a precarious situation. Whenever there is an unusual demand for money away from reserve cities, and this occurs every year in what is called the "crop-moving season," there is a heavy drawing upon the deposits kept in reserve cities and through them upon deposits in the central reserve cities, and especially at the main reserve center, New York. This is apt to occur when money is most in demand in those cities. The banks there have to yield up the reserve deposits on demand, and this may be required in "lawful money" to strengthen reserves elsewhere, and they have no resource of their own for strengthening reserve except acquiring gold or retrenching their loans. The effect is to advance money rates and restrict borrowing, and the rigid currency system prevents relief by expanding issues of bank-notes.

The effect of this annual strain is costly, but it is as nothing compared with what happens when there has been an undue extension of credit through overtrading, speculation, or other cause, and confidence becomes seriously impaired. This makes a financial crisis, which might otherwise be averted, withstood, or comfortably tided over, a disastrous affair through the attendant panic. There is no final resource beyond the banks to pin confidence to, and the banks have no means of associated effort except what they may improvise for the emergency. In the disturbed state of mind everybody wants to be paid what is due him and nobody wants to pay more than he is obliged for the time being to pay. The banks need to be exceptionally accommodating at such a time, but it is out of their power. Depositors make demands for actual cash in unusual number, which draws upon reserves and restricts loans. Country banks call home the reserves held on deposit in reserve cities and reserve city banks have to draw upon their reserve agents in central reserve cities. The whole strain con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

verges on the financial center at New York, where the banks have no resource but to unite their energies by voluntary association through the Clearing House and otherwise, to get Government deposits so far as they can, to import gold so far as they have the means, and to issue certificates based upon securities for settling balances with one another, or sometimes to serve in a limited way as currency. They must strengthen and sustain the weak places in the fabric of credit to prevent breaks which might cause a collapse of the whole structure affecting the industry and trade of the country, from which it would require years to recover.

It is not necessary to descant upon the causes or calamitous results of crises, panics, and depressions. It is enough to be reminded that in this country for forty years and more these have been partly caused and greatly intensified by our defective banking and currency system, which has left the financial community almost helpless to avert, resist, or overcome the tendencies developed in bringing them on, even when they are foreseen and counted upon. Such crises are the dread of bankers and of all men of large business responsibilities, and yet they are sometimes fatuously accused of causing them for their own benefit or advantage.

What is to be done to cure these defects and give us a safe and sound system of banking and currency? That is the main question now to be considered. The legal-tender notes of the Government are safe so long as the public credit is high and unimpaired, but it is desirable to get rid of them while that condition prevails. Redemption of the $346,000,000 and more outstanding is secured by a gold fund of $150,000,000 in the public Treasury, but they are redeemed only to be reissued, and the demand debt continues unpaid. The gold supply is now plentiful, and they could be gradually withdrawn and canceled without disturbance, their place being taken by gold coin, or certificates representing coin to the full value. The uniform bond-secured notes of the national banks are also a safe currency, but it is a rigid mass, which can only be expanded by investing capital in more bonds and contracted by taking these up and putting them on the market or holding them as a low-rate investment. There is no occasion for haste in their retirement, but it could be made gradually without loss, while the bonds were refunded at three per cent., which, with their limited volume, would maintain them at par as a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"gilt-edged" security for trust funds. The cost to the Government would be far more than compensated by the permanent benefit to the business of the country, and cost to the Government means cost to the people of the country.

So long as the volume of these notes was kept well within the steady currency requirement the quality of elasticity could be attained by a supplementary issue based upon bank credit and secured by banking resources, with adequate provision for constant redemption. Gradually the bond-secured volume could be reduced and that of credit circulation increased until the latter entirely replaced the former, if that is deemed desirable, without the least disturbance to confidence or stability. Whether individual banks should still be allowed to issue circulating notes at all, whether only those with a certain capital should have the privilege, or whether that function should be confined to one institution acting as a central agency for the whole system, is a question to be determined. It is intimately connected with the question of a proper reserve plan and a legally organized association of the banks to unify the national system and give it strength and power under proper regulation.

One thing has to be accepted as the result of conditions which have been developed in the fifty years' experience with national banking. The system cannot be turned topsy-turvy. We cannot displace the thousands of banks, with their local attachments and connections, and establish one great central institution with branches, to which all others shall be subservient or be crowded out of existence, however such an institution might be associated with the Government and made subject to official supervision. There cannot be another United States Bank of the old type, adapted to new conditions. There can be no exercising of banking power from the top down, from the apex of a financial pyramid to its broad base. The representative principle must be adopted and adapted, and the power must be exerted from the base to the apex, or, to change the figure, from the circumference to the center. With the vast extent of the country, the multitude of existing banks and the great variety of local conditions and local interests to be served, it is necessary to have, not one comprehensive association for the whole nation or union of States, but several associations within defined territorial limits, united in a central association to serve their common purposes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is a necessity of the situation, and it brings us to the controverted question of method of accomplishing a purpose upon which there is substantial agreement. The National Monetary Commission, which was created by Congress in 1908, devised a plan, reported at the end of 1911, which has not proved generally acceptable. That Commission, instead of being composed of a small number of competent experts in financial history and practice, was made up of nine Senators and nine members of the House of Representatives, few of whom had ever given serious study to the subject. Few took any active part in the Commission's work. A good deal of time and money was expended in gathering a voluminous mass of material, which would have been quite unnecessary for a competent body of experts, and which proved to be of little use. Still, a few men, capable of learning, worked up the plan which was unanimously signed by the members of the Commission and submitted to Congress. This costly work need not be thrown away, for it presents a useful outline and contains some good suggestions.

It proposes to associate the banks of the country together by districts, each with a convenient center where a central organization shall be maintained in corporate form. It provides a central agency or "National Reserve Association," in which the district associations shall be duly represented, to be located at Washington and have certain fiscal relations with the Government. This central agency would operate chiefly through branches, one at the center of organization of each district. These are in outline necessary features of the proposed system of which details may still be regarded as undetermined. Limits of space forbid dwelling here upon any but the most general considerations affecting the purposes to be attained; but, with these kept in mind and partisan rivalries excluded as wholly irrelevant to the objects aimed at, it ought not to be difficult to reconcile differences regarding essential details.

It may be said in a general way that the corporate organization of each district association should fairly represent the banks constituting it and the business community which the banks serve. It should, through competent committees, exercise supervision over its members with a view to soundness and safety in banking operations in the district, and serve as a means of communication and of working rela-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions with the central association through its branch at the district center. The central association as a corporate body should be representative of the district associations. Their members should hold its capital stock pro rata of their own capital, and they should have the controlling voice in its organization and direction. It should also act as a fiscal agency of the United States Government, which should be duly represented in its management and should exercise a defined supervision in behalf of the public.

The manner of working out details of organization and management may be here left open, and attention directed only to reasons why this general form of a unified and centralized system is necessary. For the issue of a banking currency the central agency is not absolutely essential. This function might be safely retained in the individual banks in their several districts, provided an effective plan of redemption through the district centers was maintained. But for an effective system of reserve the central association is most important. There could be a plan for the holding of a certain percentage of cash reserve by each bank in its own vault, for current requirements, with a supplementary reserve at the district center, to be drawn upon at need; but the effect of this would be an attempt at dividing the banking operations of the country into sections. They do not and will not work in sections, and it is not desirable that they should. It would be liable to develop a rivalry of sectional interests. Our domestic exchanges and the continual interchange of credits cannot be confined within State lines or sectional lines. They flow constantly to and fro in response to the demands of a business which fluctuates but never stops. If reserves are to be mobile and fully to serve their purpose, they must be movable from place to place and from district to district or section to section, and there must be a central agency for their transfer, with a reservoir of its own for their storage, to and from which they may move so far as may be necessary to meet changing requirements.

There is another potent reason why this central organization is essential. One great defect in our banking system, which has attracted little attention because we have been so long inured to it, is the lack of means for making commercial paper assets and bills of exchange liquid and transferable by indorsement and rediscount. That is a matter

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of great importance. Such a means could be supplied in a limited way by districts or sections through organized associations with their financial centers; but, as in the case of reserves, it cannot be effectively applied within such divisions of territory, because the purpose which it is to serve cannot be so confined. For an effective means of rediscount there must be a central national banking agency, not a score or more of district or "regional" agencies. There is need, not only of a means for the rediscount of commercial paper which will tend to equalize money rates throughout the country and to distribute reserve money according to requirements, but there is need of a central agency for dealing in foreign exchange and effecting international banking operations. Wtihout a central institution, with capital and resources of its own and with branches at the centers of district association through which to work, no rational banking reform can be accomplished, and to be lasting it must be rational as well as national.

If such an institution is to be had, whether it be called a "Reserve Association" or by some other name, it must have certain defined functions and the means of exercising them. It must have a large capital, which may best be contributed by the banks that it is to serve in proportion to their own capital. They should hold its stock. It must keep deposits of the member banks and have the means of rediscounting their paper, and these deposits may safely be reckoned in some part as reserves of the banks to which they are credited. It must itself have a strong reserve of "lawful money," which should consist entirely of the world's medium of exchange, gold, in the form of standard coin or bullion, and it must have the means of replenishing this by the legitimate exercise of its functions. It should be the fiscal agent of the United States Government and the depository of its Treasury funds. It ought to have the power to issue circulating notes of its own, whether those of individual banks were continued or not, secured by an ample gold reserve and constantly redeemable on demand. Their issue would greatly facilitate the operation of rediscounting for the banks through their associations, and their redemption would be effected through these at the branches.

The deposits of the banks with the central reserve agency would serve the purpose of reserves for them in a proper proportion and could be counted as such. It is a mooted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question whether its notes in the hands of the banks should be reckoned as part of the reserve money in their own keeping. Assuming that the central agency, or association, had at all times an adequate reserve of its own, with a proper ratio of gold set apart for the redemption of its notes, and about this no doubt should be left, it would be entirely safe, as well as convenient, to allow the individual banks to count those notes in their reserves against deposits. The purpose here is not to draw hard-and-fast lines, but to indicate the main outlines which must somehow be conformed to, if our banking system is to be put upon a solid and enduring basis.

AMOS K. FISKE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIALISM AND THE STATE: A FRENCH VIEW

BY JULES ROCHE, DEPUTY, FORMER MINISTER OF COMMERCE, COLONIES, POST, AND TELEGRAPH OF FRANCE

At the end of the third volume of Macaulay's admirable *History of England* occurs this passage, written just after the disturbance of 1848:

"The proudest capitals of Western Europe have streamed with civil blood. . . . Doctrines hostile to all sciences, to all arts, to all industry, to all domestic charities, doctrines which, if carried into effect, would, in thirty years, undo all that thirty centuries have done for mankind, and would make the fairest provinces of France and Germany as savage as Congo or Patagonia, have been avowed from the tribune and defended by the sword. Europe has been threatened with subjugation by barbarians, compared with whom the barbarians who marched under Attila and Alboin were enlightened and humane. The truest friends of the people have with deep sorrow owned that interests more precious than any political privileges were in jeopardy, and that it might be necessary to sacrifice even liberty in order to save civilization."

The doctrines mentioned by Macaulay, after keeping in the background for a time, have now come to the fore again, grown little by little in force, until they have burst forth into new splendor, have given birth to organized parties which are striving every day more energetically to transform the idea into permanent acts and facts, and displaying in this work so much perseverance and audacity that, if the English historian were a witness of what is now going on, he would experience a deeper anguish than that which he expressed so eloquently sixty-four years ago.

It is now some time since the Socialist movement has shown itself in all countries, in a more or less intense form and in an apparently new shape, that of State Socialism. It is true that Socialism really remains what it has always been and what it must always be—that is, revolutionary;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for its very definition makes it so, since it proclaims itself to be the systematic enemy of all the principles necessary to the existence of civilized society and declares its platform to be their destruction.

Is it, therefore, possible to imagine that the State in a civilized country can adopt and apply the principles of Socialism? Is there not an irreducible contradiction between the two? In order to make this contradiction clear to all eyes, it is first necessary to point out the essential principles of Socialism.

What, then, is Socialism? Those who see in it only its political platform do not get beneath the surface; this is only the minor side of the matter; its least strong side. What we must discover in Socialism is the cause of this platform. This cause is simple; it is an idea, and a profoundly false one, concerning the origin of evil. At bottom, Socialism is especially a philosophical doctrine, almost a sort of religion. It believes and teaches that the inequality of conditions among men arises from laws emanating from Governments; that the State can create riches and regulate at its will the distribution of these riches; that capital is the enemy of labor; that " the development of the capitalist order is responsible for the working class "; that, in a word, all the evils, or nearly all, from which mankind suffers, are produced by " society," and that it depends upon the legislator to reorganize this society arbitrarily, in accordance with a new plan in which the State will be all and the individual nothing, when universal felicity will reign. In a word, Socialism is a peculiar conception of the nature of man, and of the rôle and the power of the State. This is its particular stamp, the essential of its errors and dangers; what follows is simply the consequence of this. Laws which put an end to property and inheritance; the nationalization of mines, factories, railways, and banks; the organization of a system of universal functionaryism—all this, and still other legislative proposals of the Socialist parties, is but the application to particular cases of the ruling idea. It does not suffice, therefore, to combat these projects separately, though this is of course necessary, for in this way you simply push them back for the moment; they crop up again immediately. The only effective remedy is to destroy the initial error which engenders all the others. This is not an easy task, as it cannot be accomplished in a day

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and is an old story; for, it should be remembered, that the doctrines of the Socialists of to-day have always been known. They have invented nothing new; their conceptions are as old as human illusions.

I would not say that laws have never been or are not now unjust, that they have never established privileges for some and doomed others to inferior position and even to servitude; but these laws, which were in fact Socialistic, for they organized society though arbitrarily by violating liberty, no longer exist, at least in the United States, in France, in Switzerland, nor even in civilized monarchies, where we find only political inequalities, which are without influence, when compared with natural things, on the conditions essential to the happiness of the individual.

In order to grasp the full truth of what I say, to see it with the mind's eye as well as with the ordinary eye, we have simply to glance at the state of humanity to-day and at its state in the past. As, according to Socialism, "the capitalist organization" is the root of evil, this evil would not have existed at the beginning of our race. So the greatest well-being and the least misery should be found to-day in those parts of the globe where the capitalist régime is the least developed.

When it is stated in the presence of thousands of workmen, whose infantile imagination is enflamed by ardent words and whose untrained reason is misled by sophisms, that the difficulties of this life spring from the present social order, the inference is that humanity was born in a terrestrial paradise and that we have but to turn to the tribes of Asia, South America, Africa, and Oceania, who have kept nearest to the primitive state and furthest away, consequently, from "the capitalist state," to find there the happiest of beings dwelling among the pleasures of Eden. But I should like to see these fiery apostles of Socialism reduced to the lot of the Fuegians, the Bushmen, and the Australian aborigines, who are so completely protected from the evils of the capitalist!

On the contrary, what should be said without cessation to the workers, to those who have the hardest time in life, is that all progress implies capital, all capital implies work, all fruitful work implies liberty, all liberty implies property, and that the ideal of the human race is not behind us but before us.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The nearer man is to nature, the more he is under the domination of his enemy, the more miserable he is and the more he is the foe of his kind. Without going into a profound analysis of the human passions, we have only to regard the most visible and most certain phenomena of life to perceive that the decrease of the evils which afflict our race is in direct proportion to the development of this capitalist order whom the Socialists are never weary of anathematizing. There is no worse error than that of Rousseau. The most unfortunate, the most feeble, the most suffering of men, is the primitive man, who lives from hand to mouth, without arms, without instruments, with no capital to shield him from want for the moment while he has time to look about him in order to improve his lot. What the philosopher of Geneva saw so badly, the admirable mind of Lucretius grasped immediately and without error. What a faithful picture of the condition of man before the capitalist régime was born is traced by the powerful poet of "The Nature of Things," ignorant of all the geological and prehistoric archæological discoveries of our times, who sang:

"Then our first ancestors did not yet know how to master things by fire, nor to use skins and to cover their bodies with the skins of the wild beasts; they lived in the woods, in caves, in the forests, and hid in the brushwood their rude limbs, obliged to flee the attacks of the wind and rain."

It is from such conditions, and not from the Golden Age, that we are sprung, and if, little by little, we have reached the point where we now are, it is due to capital, which began with the first flint hammer; it is due to the incessant efforts of human genius, which tamed by degrees the forces of matter and bent them to our needs, which conceived and spread the ideas of justice, liberty, love of neighbor, conceptions so different from the ferocity and the state of soul of our first parents. But instead of continuing in this way of progress, Socialism would destroy the necessary elements and conditions which make it possible. In defiance of the most constant facts and the most profound forces of the human heart, Socialism pretends to build up a complete Utopian city, which would in fact be the worst sort of a prison, where would be confined the mind, and which would soon become the theater of the deepest misery into which humanity has ever been plunged.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No; evil does not spring from society or even from laws, which does not mean, however, that the legislature cannot better the laws. Evil springs from nature, not yet sufficiently mastered by science; it is in us, not yet sufficiently purified, sufficiently elevated by reason, by the arts, by thought; it is in the mind, in the very heart of these thaumaturgi who declare it to be in the laws and would have us believe in their chimerical power to remove it if we only confide the making of the laws to them! If ever there were a true remark, it is this: "Socialism, that is the enemy!"

But I would not have my readers say that I hold that all is for the best in the best of worlds; that evil no longer exists, that there is no injustice, that there is no social progress to be realized. All that I wish to say is that Socialism, far from curing human suffering, will only make it worse, that its innovations would produce only misery, because they would suppress the conditions which alone have been able to diminish this misery.

Having thus established, even from out its own mouth, just what Socialism is, the question may now be pertinently asked whether the State can become Socialistic without placing itself in direct contradiction with the laws of nature and the conditions of its own rôle. The whole problem lies right here. What is the State and what is its part in its relations with the individual? What is the respective sphere of each? It is not the first time that the subject has been under discussion. Long before Montesquieu, Plato and Cicero had applied their genius to the problem. Still nearer our day, William von Humboldt, in his celebrated essay which appeared in 1792, devoted all his powerful faculties to an attempt to decide what are the limits of the action of the State. About 1858, the great English philosopher, John Stuart Mill, in his excellent little book, *Liberty;* in 1884, Herbert Spencer in *The Man versus the State;* and before him that wonderful mind, too much neglected to-day, and to whom my generation owes so many generous and noble ideas, Edouard Laboulaye, in *The State and its Limits,* published in 1863, explained every hidden corner of this difficult problem.

Regardless of any special doctrines, history shows, for its part, how dangerous are the theories and illusions so much in favor to-day, not only among the charlatans, which is quite natural, but among many disinterested and well-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intentioned people desirous of progress and justice. Historical observation of this kind plainly reveals the errors of the conception of a Providential State and the benefits to be derived from a régime of complete individual liberty. Alas! how the unfortunate are deceived when they are led to believe in the all-powerfulness of the State and are promised an end of all their trials and woes through State intervention! The State has not and cannot have this chimerical power. Without entering into a philosophical and theoretical discussion of principles, of the "rights" of the individual and the "duties" of society, let us glance for a moment, purely and simply, at material facts, at the things which one sees with the eye and touches with the hand.

By whom were brought about all the progress, all the discoveries, all the conquests which have, little by little, ameliorated the lot of primitive humanity, and which shelter us to-day, in part at least, from famine and the attacks of the enemy, Nature? Who has made it possible for men to vanquish cold, time, space? Who has succeeded even in softening the habits and ferocity of the early ages? Who has caused to penetrate into our very souls love of fellowman, the sentiment of justice, the conception of the rights of others, the sublime idea of sacrifice? It is not Governments that have accomplished this, nor States, in any period of the world's history or in any country. This was the work of individuals, of private persons. It was some unknown genius who discovered the art of making fire, of forging iron, of plowing, of crossing the oceans, of spinning, of sewing skins together, of weaving. It was some poet, philosopher, wise man, nun, who charmed our hearts with song and formed our souls by noble examples. These are the true benefactors of the human race, the real authors of civilization and progress. And how often, far from being encouraged, were they thwarted, impeded, even persecuted in their divine tasks by the blind, ignorant, cruel heads of States, as is even too frequently the case to-day with men of all conditions. It is true, fortunately for the honor of humanity, that we do frequently find wise, well-meaning Governments. But the best they could do was to aid these great men, the individuals of powerful genius, laboring for the general development of progress and the conquest of civilization.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In a civilized nation, the rôle of the State is to assure public order and to guarantee to every individual the full exercise of his faculties, that is, to see that he enjoys liberty and that the independence of his nation is not infringed upon. As for creating wealth and regulating its distribution, the State is as absolutely and unquestionably powerless as it would be in trying to change the sequence of the seasons, to modify the temperature, or to influence barometric pressure. It is only the individual who can create wealth, by his intelligence and his labor, and the freer the individual is in the exercise of his natural faculties, the more can he ameliorate not only his own situation but also the general condition of humanity. This is what history teaches us with striking evidence from the time of the earliest cave-dwellers, and it suffices, regardless of all metaphysical considerations, to determine in their grand lines and governing ideals the rôle and the limits of the State and the individual.

It is true that in answering the questions which I formulated above, the same reply does not hold good for all ages and for all countries. It is not unique, invariable, permanent, like a theorem of geometry. It admits, however, of durable elements, of varieties of experience which are constant, so that to-day we may consider certain facts so well established that they appear to have become laws. Let us specify some of the principal ones.

I repeat that universal observation shows us that nearly all the progress which has improved the material lot of man is due to individual effort, and very rarely to any intervention of the State; quite the contrary. We have seen that these efforts were often combated and retarded by the State. How many are the scientific discoveries whose authors were at first officially condemned. The long list may be said to begin with Philolaus and Aristarchus of Samos, who lived more than two thousand years before Galileo, and both of whom were exiled for having taught that the earth turned on its own axis and revolved around the sun. State action never, or almost never, appears as a creator of progress. The contrary is true. Progress is the work of the individual. But State action is eminently salutary and fecund in an indirect fashion when it comes forward as a guarantor of security and peace, which render possible the free play of individuals capable of doing things—but how

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rare such individuals are!—in a word, as an efficacious principle of public order.

What is true of the scientific domain properly so called, *viz.*, mathematics, physics, chemistry, mechanics, astronomy, and so forth, is not less true of the moral domain. The idea of justice, duty, charity, love of neighbor was instilled little by little into the heart and mind of men by the noblest intelligences, by the highest and best souls, who, by the very fact that they are the best, are the least numerous; and yet how often are these grand spirits persecuted by the makers and executors of the laws!

Has the State, which has never created progress, either moral or scientific, known how to aid happily moral or material works, in conformity with or depending on the laws of progress, observing the conditions of true progress, that is to say, rendering possible the free action of the best individuals? Here again observation reveals the same results—the incapacity of the State, in fact its very nocuousness.

Direct, actual, immediate observation, as was the case with historical observation, shows that all human material progress proceeds from property and freedom of labor. You have simply to open your eyes to perceive that everywhere and always the lot of the greater number is bettered in proportion as economic liberty and security develops. There cannot be found a single example to the contrary. On the other hand, how many instances are there of progress being checked by attacks on the liberty of labor and its consequences! How long it was before this principle of principles dawned on the human mind, *viz.*, the freer individual action becomes, the more the whole community profits by it; whereas, the more collective action, that is, the State in whatever form it shows itself, paralyzes individual action, the more the community suffers from its own intervention!

For instance, if at first glance any enterprise seems to belong properly to the State, to the legislator, to the Prince, it is the providing of food for the public—in a word, all subsistence arrangements. It was the great care of the governments of the past. The Roman Republic, the Consuls, the Senate; Cæsars and Emperors, from the divine Augustus down to the lamentable Augustulus overturned by the barbarians; the kingdom of France during the whole period of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" the thousand-year monarchy," one and all considered it their first duty " to feed the people." Every effort, every institution, every system; all sorts of administrative machinery, whether the most powerful, the most subtle, or the most ingenious; all imaginable laws for arranging, interdicting, encouraging, recompensing, and punishing; all that irresistible force, hostile art, implacable will were able to invent, perfect, and combine in order to protect against famine King Populace,—all this and much else besides was set to work; and this went on from the time of the edicts of 438 B.C., down to the interminable prescriptions of the Theodosian Code, including the taking over by the State of all the fleets of the seas and the rivers. And what was the result of it all? Complete disaster! Agriculture was killed and pauperism was developed. The character and energy of the individual were enfeebled to such a point that universal servitude followed. The strain on the public treasury was so great that the State was bankrupt. Italy, the Provinces, the Empire were ruined, and fell an easy prey to the Heruli of Odoacer. Socialist laws, anti-militarism, State ownership killed the colossus.

In France, " the sons of St. Louis " were not less unfortunate. With the advent of Philip the Fair, the inventor of the income tax (1294 and January 12, 1295), by the aid of which this coiner of base money decreed in 1304 a series of measures tending " to the greatest relief and greatest providing of provisions for my poor people," the history of France from that time on is full of " laws " with the same end in view. To be convinced of this, one has only to read the ordinances of 1410, 1419, 1455, 1507, 1571, 1573, 1689, 1690, 1693, 1709, 1720, 1723, 1731, 1737, 1763, etc., etc.; to read the correspondence of Louis XIV.'s reign, the letters which passed between the ministers and the intendants, and those of the Comptroller-General of the Finances, from 1683 to 1715; and then one perceives that all that which the boldest Socialist and radical " reformer " puts forward to-day was conceived by the " reformers " of the old régime in their aim " to feed the people," to " assure the subsistence of the people " and " at the lowest possible price "; and that the most rigorous measures were taken to secure the faithful observance of these " Socialist laws." But all this met with the same fate as the ancient edicts of the Empire. In a word, State corn, State flour, State millers, State

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bakers, State aid, and State benefactions of all kinds; no matter whether the State be a republic, an empire, a monarchy, an oligarchy, a democracy, an ochlocracy, or a tyranny,—the result is found to be the same, that is, the very contrary of what was sought! Instead of an alleviation of the ill, there was an aggravation thereof; a destruction of the only force capable of curing it; precipitated crises; ruin!

So many and such persistent lessons finally produced fruit; minds that were particularly open and penetrating became enlightened and were convinced that the only efficacious spring to human effort is liberty and responsibility, that the individual must be made to understand that the bettering of his lot depends solely on himself, that he must help himself before he asks Heaven to help him, that the more the Prince or the State usurps the place of the individual, enervates the spring of his action and leads him to believe that they can supply his wants, by so much they weaken the individual and prepare his misfortune.

This was the grand discovery of the economists of the eighteenth century. After long struggles, "the new spirit" finally triumphed, publicly and officially, when Turgot came into power in 1774. This is an important date in the history of civilization, for, for the first time, the economic rôle of the State was at last understood and set forth with an incomparable power of truth and a breadth of view. We read in the preamble of the ordinance of 1774:

> "The more commerce is free, animated, and extensive, the more promptly and efficaciously does it find abundant markets; prices are more uniform and depart less from the average price on which salaries are necessarily based. The plan of the Government furnishing provisions cannot be a success. The attention of Government is too divided among many things and cannot be so active as that of the merchant wholly occupied with his own business. Consequently, when Government monopolizes the transport and guard of grain, it compromises the subsistence and the peace of its people. It is only commerce and free commerce that can correct the inequality of crops."

The language of this ordinance made a profound impression on the public mind. One might have thought that the century-old superstitious faith in the Providential State had now vanished forever, that the servitude of man to the Prince, whether this Prince were a single person or were represented by a collection of persons, was at an end; and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that labor was finally unfettered, as it already was in fact, awaiting the moment when it would be also by law. But this illusion did not last long. Two years later, Turgot was vanquished and discharged from the ministry. Unfortunately, Louis XVI. could not bring himself to wait until these great truths had time to produce their fruits. Free commerce, industry, and labor return to the old yoke of governmental quacks, only to secure their liberty in 1789, and to lose it again under the Jacobin rule of 1793; so difficult is it to conquer and retain this prime *summum bonum* of the people, this sacred force, this unique source of all progress. But Turgot's revenge came, as I have said, in 1789, when the Rights of Man were proclaimed in France in all their plenitude, after having been proclaimed in the United States on July 4, 1776, as being the very basis of the State and not a condescending gift therefrom. Free thought and free labor, which are but the essential forms of the free possession of man by himself; and the security of property, which is but the product of that free possession, were henceforth regarded in France as axioms of civilization and progress and were announced at the head of the Constitution. And then happened in the history of France events whose political effect is of such importance that they should be meditated upon by all nations in order that these nations may draw therefrom a lesson that will save them from similar faults and cruel experiences.

The home and foreign events of the early months of 1793 had so profoundly troubled the country that their inevitable consequences were felt on every side. It was equally inevitable that the persons whose "political science" consists in exploiting public misfortune and popular credulity by promising miracles in order to secure the support and the favor of the masses, would profit by these circumstances. The "heelers" of the popular quarters of Paris appeared in the galleries of the Convention, to find on the floor accomplices not less bustling and ardent than themselves. The Jacobin delegation from the suburbs terrorized, on April 30th, the Assembly, essentially cowardly like all assemblies, by the declaration of the conscious "boss" who headed it and who exclaimed in a threatening tone: "I come in the name of ten thousand men, who are at your doors, to demand that you re-establish the maximum. If you do not do it, we will declare an insurrection!" This threat sufficed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Four days later was issued the decree of May 4, 1793, which required every farmer, merchant, and miller to declare the quantity of grain in his possession; which provided for committees appointed by the municipalities to revise these declarations and to fix the average price of grain in accordance with the average in each department, from January 1st to May 1st; which pronounced the most rigorous punishment—death, even—for those who should conceal or destroy corn; which offered rewards to informers—in a word, a decree containing the whole series of measures which characterize "Socialist laws" engendered by those baleful "well-wishers of the People."

Once again, material things revolted; the famine simply increased. Then the lawmakers grew stubborn. The decree concerning grain was followed, one after the other, by decrees concerning wood, coal, peat, oats, oil, butter, vinegar, meat, cattle—all kinds of imaginable merchandise; these decrees meting out penalties, fines, imprisonment, the holy guillotine, and offering bounties for the "patriotic" soup kitchen; the decrees, in a word, running the whole gamut of radical panaceas. But finally the most obstinate were forced to see things as they really were; like Philip the Fair, the Convention had to repent. The dire disasters which these "Socialist laws" brought down on the land opened the eyes of the lawmakers and with their own hands they put an end to their stupid and deadly work. On December 25, 1794, the committees of Public Safety, General Security, Legislation, and of Commerce and Finance held a joint meeting and recommended to the Convention through their chairman, Joannot, the total suppression of all the decrees relating to subsistence. The text of the report deserves to be quoted. It runs as follows:

"The short-sighted members, who, yielding to popular demands, voted in favor of the establishment of the maximum, have not had to wait long to see their mistake. . . . Thence have sprung all the laws, destructive of commerce and industry, which followed one another so rapidly. . . . If trade had not been hampered by fetters, if it had only been left to itself, if the most innocent speculations had not been regarded as crimes by the ignorant [applause on the left], the activity of the merchants would have provisioned France, notwithstanding the disasters of war, as they have done more than once in the past. But the Government usurped the place of the merchants, thereby destroying individual industry and its own riches, which it then found itself unable to restore." [Loud applause.]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is unnecessary to add anything to such a striking lesson in order to demonstrate the inevitable disaster sure to follow the intervention of the State in opposition to the natural laws of economic phenomena. Nor was the lesson lost. Little by little, among all nations, whatever their political form may be — monarchy, empire, republic — the axioms proclaimed in America and in France in 1776 and 1789, and determining the rôle of the State, have become part and parcel of public law. They are inscribed to-day in all Constitutions and are victoriously making the tour of the globe. And now, simultaneously in all parts, is a revival of the ancient and coarsest of errors. A furious assault is being made on the principles which alone give life. And by whom is the battle waged? By monarchs who have lost their absolute power? No! By the very enfranchised people themselves! It is the emancipated Number become Sovereign who is striving to put new irons on the individual; who would destroy the rights of man, the instruments for the bettering of his lot, the means of general progress, by destroying free labor and the liberty of contract. Formerly, the enemy was the Royal Power; to-day, it is the Uncountable Power. And the latter has recourse now to the same arms as those used by the former in the past, *viz.*, the law. It was in the name of the law, which he himself imposed, backing it by force, that the king, in times gone by, enchained liberty. It is in the name of the law, of which he has become the all-powerful creator, that the contemporary Number undertakes to destroy liberty. The nefarious work is already begun. In the countries where he can act efficaciously, in France, for instance, the first effects are beginning to be felt. Individual effort is slackening, production is diminishing, the burdens of life are growing heavier, the ascending movement is checked in proportion as the State superstition revives and spreads. If it finally triumphs, it will be a new invasion of the barbarians, in another form but similarly disastrous; and it is advancing! Many pretend not to see it, because it does not march armed with torch and ax, but with the Law in its hand; and this is the very reason why it is the more dangerous. But there is some comfort in the knowledge that the will of man is powerless here; that what these innovators preach is in contradiction with Things; and the former cannot avail against the latter. It is the old battle over again, the free com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merce of grain vainly proclaimed by Turgot in 1774. It is untrammeled science and its works which feeds the nations and checks famine, as far as the laws of nature permit. No written law or State can do anything here. The same thing is true of all economic phenomena and of all that can be done to improve the lot of man. The solution can be found only in the free efforts of individuals.

The material facts which are happening before our very eyes are new proofs of this, new proofs of what has occurred in all epochs and in all countries. Let us turn, for instance, and note the results obtained in America by private effort as compared with those obtained in Europe, in the countries where the hand of the State weighs everywhere more or less heavily and where it often exercises a positive harm. Such a comparison redounds strikingly to the credit of private initiative and to the discredit of State interference. We first turn to France. In France the telegraph is a State monopoly; in the United States, the contrary is the case. In France, there are about 450,000 kilometers of wire, whereas in America I find that the figures surpass 2,700,000 kilometers, in taking into account only the most important companies. In France the telephone was at first a private enterprise. But the State is jealous when it sees anybody doing anything new, so it monopolized the telephone, as it did the telegraph; and here is the result. In France, with its 40,000,000 of inhabitants, there are about 130,000 kilometers of telephone wires and 232,743 telephones. In the United States, my statistics show 22,326,000 kilometers of wire and 7,596,000 telephones for 93,000,000 inhabitants. That is to say, in the United States private industry furnishes one telephone for about twelve inhabitants, while in France there is one for about every 171 inhabitants. In France the State has a tight grip on the railway systems. They owe their existence to the State and live under its authority, it might almost be said under its legislative and administrative absolutism, cramped in some directions by contracts which the State is ever ready to violate. And what do we find? In 1910, we had about 50,000 kilometers of railways, or one kilometer for every 800 inhabitants, while in the United States, where railways enjoyed until 1887 an almost absolute liberty and where, luckily for the country, they are freer than anywhere in Europe, we find that in 1910 there were about 403,000 kilometers, or one for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every 230 inhabitants. When compared with the whole of Europe, the showing is still better. Thus, there are about 330,000 kilometers in all Europe—that is, the 93,000,000 inhabitants of the United States possess 70,000 more kilometers of railways than the 450,000,000 Europeans! And yet it was in Europe that the locomotive was invented and that railways were first built. But the United States soon outstripped all Europe. At the end of 1847, the United States, on account of the freedom of individual enterprise, and the absence of all legislative and administrative hampering, had in operation more than 8,400 kilometers of road, while England had 5,318, Germany 5,291, France 2,018, and all Europe 14,205. But at the end of 1883, things had greatly changed. According to the official tables of our Ministry of Public Works, all Europe then had 183,131 kilometers and the United States 194,000; that is, Europe was 11,000 behind, while to-day it is 70,000 behind.

To whatever field of human activity one turns, the same thing is found to be true—superiority of individual initiative and liberty of work, inferiority of State action, always heavier, slower, more costly, less fecund. What, then, would not be the disastrous consequences if the day ever comes when the State, no longer satisfied with simple intervention and moderate regulation, should become the sole, direct, and universal agent of labor and of the economic product of a people?

Thus the conclusion of our examination is decisive. The incapacity of the State as a creator of progress, whether material or moral, is a fact beyond question. The works which pertain to this sphere of civilization are foreign to the rôle of the State and belong exclusively to the individual left free but protected. The part of the State is to assure order, and it is an important part, for without order, the efforts of the individual creators of progress are lost in the chaos of blind home or foreign disorder. Hence, in the front rank of the duties of the State stands the defense of the frontiers, the protection of the nation from an outside enemy, and at the same time, a similar protection of person and property at home. There is no "Socialist law" which can dispense with the necessity of the soldier, cannon, marines, ironclads, the constable, the policeman, the gendarme, the judge.

None of us are prophets. Nobody can say what will be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the condition of our race thousands of centuries hence. But we know what it always has been and what it cannot be in the present state of the world. It is absolutely subject to the law which requires all to labor. By obeying this law, man has been able, up to the present, to better his lot, and it is by continuing to obey it that he alone can hope to make further progress. Those who dream of obtaining this progress, not only through their own effort but by the aid of the State, are dupes of the most dangerous error. Outside the limits of its rôle as I have defined it the State becomes the great fiction, where everybody tries to live at the expense of everybody. Those who pretend to be statesmen but who make laws and govern regardless of the nature of things will not succeed in transforming the State into a Providence, but into a Scourge.

JULES ROCHE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CHANGING ARMAMENTS OF EUROPE

BY SYDNEY BROOKS

"By reason of the events which are taking place in the Balkans the balance of European power has been shifted." It was in these words that the German Government on March 28th officially opened its explanation of the enormous, the unparalleled increase in military strength and equipment for which it had resolved to secure the sanction of the Reichstag. The explanation has the rare merit of really explaining. The war in the Balkans has not only shifted the balance of European power, but has shifted it profoundly to Germany's disadvantage. It has done so in four obvious and well-defined particulars. In the first place Turkey has been eliminated from the chess-board of European politics, possibly not as a problem, but certainly as an active military Power of any account. All the friendship and fostering protection which Germany has lavished on the Ottoman Empire are now proved to have been profitless. They brought in a certain commercial and political return for many years, but in the final reckoning they have turned out a bad investment; and all the hopes of military assistance and co-operation that went hand in hand with them have likewise been dissipated. It is to-day, and in all human probability will forever remain, beyond the power of the Turks to hold the Slav States of southeastern Europe in check in the event of a war between the Dual and the Triple Alliance. So long as they could effect that much Austria-Hungary was virtually relieved from apprehensions on her southern frontier and was in a position to move her armies when and where she chose. From the standpoint of the Teutonic Powers, therefore, the Turkish *débâcle* is equivalent to the removal of a prop on which they confidently expected to rely in the hour of need.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But it is also much more than that. Not only have the Turks been obliterated, but their place has been taken by vigorous Slav States whose policies are little likely to be attuned to the needs or wishes of either Vienna or Berlin. Not only, therefore, has the Triple Alliance lost a friend, but it has found a whole series of potential enemies. It is, of course, always hazardous to speak of nationalities in terms of races. The history of the Balkan peninsula has repeatedly shown that men are Bulgarians, Servians, Montenegrins, and so on, before they are Slavs, and that the sense of a common kinship, and even—in those regions a much more vital matter—of a common faith, does not prevent them from quarreling both with one another and with Russia. None the less it is palpable that the events of the past six months have resulted in a signal uplifting of the Slav race as a whole as well as of certain Slav peoples in particular. The prestige of Slavdom has been immensely enhanced, its power fortified, its aspirations and energies revived and strengthened beyond computation; and in all these items Deutschthum has undergone a corresponding eclipse. Russia has gained, Germany and Austria-Hungary have lost. And their loss is very much more than an intangible and sentimental loss of authority and repute. It is direct, menacing, material. Rightly or wrongly the world of European diplomacy has long looked upon Rumania, with its excellent army of over a quarter of a million, as virtually a fourth member of the Triple Alliance; and Rumania herself has persistently claimed to be regarded not as a Balkan State, but rather as the most easterly of the Powers of Europe. But in the new situation that has arisen with the rise of aggressive Slav States immediately beyond her southern frontier, it is clear that Rumania could only espouse the Teutons against the Slavs at the utmost peril to herself; and while, so long as King Charles lives and reigns, there is not likely to be any change in Rumania's policy of sagacious neutrality, and while the combinations of Balkan politics in the future are beyond prediction, the broad tendency of events appears decidedly to favor the idea that Rumania will drift away from the central European Powers and will throw in her lot with the enlarged Balkan States. At any rate, she can no longer be counted on with anything like the old confidence as an asset on the Teutonic side.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But, besides this, the emergence of a Greater Bulgaria, and especially of a Greater Servia, flushed with victory, of tested military efficiency, and with unexpected resources to draw upon, necessarily throws out of gear the whole scheme of Austro-Hungarian strategy. Along her most vulnerable frontier the Dual Monarchy sees the erection of States whose peoples not only nourish an historic enmity against her, but are united by ties of the closest sympathy and kinship with many millions of her least loyal subjects. Even in times of peace every domestic difficulty with which the Germans and Magyars of Austria-Hungary have to contend in preserving their ascendency over the Slav majority cannot but be greatly intensified by the magnetic neighborhood and intrigues of the new Slav States. But in time of war those difficulties would instantaneously react on the military situation. A conflict between the Triple Alliance and Russia might then prove a signal both for a rebellion of the Slav subjects in the Dual Monarchy and for an attack from without by the Slav Powers of the Balkans. Both these possibilities, of course, have existed before, but never in so formidable a degree as now. It was one of Moltke's dicta that owing to the interests which Austria-Hungary had to protect in the south and east she could not always act as an ally with the whole, but only with a part, of her full strength. But even Moltke did not foresee a time when the Balkan States, having crushed Turkey on the battle-field, would girdle the southern frontiers of the Dual Monarchy with a force at least seven hundred thousand and possibly over a million strong. Had he done so he would probably have admitted that such a development had reduced Austria-Hungary's effectiveness as an ally to not far from the vanishing-point and that the necessity of safeguarding her territory against the invasion of the southern Slavs had become so onerous as to leave her with little strength or thought for the major campaign against Russia. The struggle in the Balkans, therefore, has deprived the Teutonic Powers of the help that Turkey might, and almost certainly would, have rendered them; it has seriously weakened, it may before long prove to have severed, the ties of self-interest that for thirty years and more have bound Rumania to the Triple Alliance; it has registered the highest point of power and influence yet reached by Slavdom; and it has studded Austria-Hungary's flank with States whose concerted action

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the event of a war between the Great Powers would need pretty well all the attention that she could give it.

All these are developments exceedingly detrimental to German interests. Moreover, they have happened at a time when a variety of circumstances have combined to magnify their capacity for harm, and when, even without them, the statesmen of the Wilhelmstrasse and the Ballplatz might well have had grounds for uneasiness. Of these other factors the most disturbing is the extraordinary recovery of Russia since the disasters of the Far-Eastern war. The dying down of the revolutionary agitation, the steady progress in the work of internal reform, and the vastly improved condition of Russian commerce and finances, have been accompanied by a sweeping and effective military reorganization. In training, equipment, in material and personnel, and above all in initiative and confidence, the Russian army, which stands at a peace strength of some 1,500,000 men, is beyond comparison better prepared for war to-day than it was a decade or even half a decade ago. Communications, it is true, though much improved, are still comparatively backward, and the consignment disadvantage of a faulty distribution and of a tardy mobilization has not yet been overcome. But the Germans are as well aware of the improvement in the Russian forces as they are of the revival of the national spirit throughout the Czardom which preceded, and has been strongly reinforced by, the prestige accruing to the Russian name through the Slav victories in the Balkans; and from their point of view the rehabilitation of their eastern neighbor is all the more disquieting because the wire that in the shrewder Bismarckian days was never for long permitted to get out of order between St. Petersburg and Berlin was strained all but to breaking a few years ago when Germany sprang " in shining armor " to the side of her Austrian ally in order to prevent Russia's intervention on behalf of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Not only, therefore, is Russia more powerful to-day than perhaps at any time in her history, but she is still smarting under the humiliation of 1909 and has resumed her old place in the councils of Europe, and something more than her old place in the affairs of the Balkans, in a spirit of anything but gratitude or friendliness to German policy.

Simultaneously with all this, Italy, never a very wholehearted member of the Triplice, never quite at ease in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forced company of Austria-Hungary, has become absorbed in the responsibilities she has contracted in Tripoli and finds herself in closer sympathy with Russia, France, and Great Britain than with her own allies. Nor when the Germans turn to the other, the western, quarter of the horizon is the sky much clearer. For France has undoubtedly in the past eighteen months been seized with a spirit of self-reliance and energy so different from her mood of 1905, when at Germany's bidding she sacrificed the ablest Foreign Minister that the Republic has yet produced, as to seem almost like an attack of Chauvinism. It is not really that, but unquestionably it indicates an attitude that would make any repetition of the manœuvers and pinpricks that Germany resorted to during the Morocco crisis an extremely hazardous venture. France does not meditate a swoop upon Germany for the recovery of the lost provinces, for revenge, or for any other purpose; but she has grown into a firm belief in herself and her army and she is in no mood to be browbeaten and dictated to. All round the circumference of her Continental interests Germany, in short, finds herself menaced as never before. She sees opening before her a disastrous prospect of the "inevitable" conflict between Teuton and Slav occurring under conditions more unfavorable to her chances of success than any that have obtained in the past forty years. The upheaval in the Balkans has placed her at a conscious disadvantage, and the grim possibility of a war on two fronts once more oppresses her. Always to some extent an imprisoned Empire, she now feels as though she were literally held in a vise. Her friends and allies have been robbed of much of their power to succor her and her enemies have suddenly multiplied in numbers, might, and daring. Not for a hundred years has Germany faced any such crisis, and the spirit in which she has risen to grapple with it gives us more than a little insight into the qualities of tenacity, providence, and self-sacrifice that enabled her to struggle from under, and finally to overthrow, the Napoleonic domination.

Such, then, are the chief causes of that prodigious increase of armaments which Germany regards—and no one, I think, will say unjustly or hastily regards—as indispensable to her security. She has met the dangers that threaten her by bringing forward the biggest Army Bill ever proposed in the history of Parliamentary Government. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

total increase in her military forces which has been decided upon consists of 4,000 officers, 15,000 non-commissioned officers, 117,000 corporals and private soldiers, and 27,000 horses. This means that about 163,000 new recruits are to be taken annually in order to increase the peace strength of the existing army and to create certain new units. I do not propose to go into the details of the new measure. It will be enough to say that it raises the total peace effective of the German army to over 800,000, that it brings the proportion of men serving with the colors to almost exactly the one per cent. provided by the Constitution, that it will enable the frontier regiments to be kept on practically a war-footing, and that it involves a non-recurring expenditure of some $260,000,000 and a permanent annual increase in the army estimates of nearly $50,000,000. Germany's military problem is precisely the opposite of that of France; it is a problem not of men, but of money; and while German opinion has frankly recognized the necessity of the immense additions demanded by the Government, yet the financial scheme for carrying them out has met with a good deal of criticism. What the Government proposes is to raise the whole of the non-recurring expenditure by a tax of one-half per cent. on the value of all property worth more than $2,500, supplemented by a special levy on incomes of over $12,500. These provisions demonstrate better than anything else the severity of the crisis which the German Government conceives itself to be facing. A single enforced tax on the capital of property, including the assets of all public companies, is not a device that any economist has ever been known to favor except in times of war or of great emergency when almost any expedient that does not defeat its own object is justifiable. It is without precedent in Germany in normal times; the only occasion on which it was resorted to being the patriotic uprising of Prussia against Napoleon a hundred years ago; and its adoption to-day emphasizes the growing disparity between the national resources and the national expenditure, overrides the arrangement which hitherto has relegated property taxes to the Federated States for their own revenue purposes, and proclaims, as some German papers have been quick to point out, the virtual bankruptcy of the national Treasury. When it is remembered that an issue of Prussian bonds at over four per cent. a few weeks ago was a complete failure, that the German money

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

market has for months been in a state of desperation, and that all German commerce is conducted on a credit basis, it will be seen that the required $260,000,000 cannot be raised from individuals and corporations except by methods that will make a much larger inroad upon capital than even that enormous sum. Nor do the ways and means proposed for meeting the permanent annual increase of $50,000,000 at all modify one's estimate of the critical character of the situation. What the Imperial Government suggests is that fresh contributions should be made by the Federated States in the form of property, income, and inheritance taxes; that the reduction of the sugar duty, which by legislation less than twelve months old was to take effect on or before October 1, 1916, shall be postponed by one year; and that the Imperial War Fund shall be increased by issuing $30,000,000 in silver and the same amount in paper. These are all drastic provisions. They will be sanctioned by the Reichstag because all Germany perceives the need of a special effort in face of the new international perils that encompass her and because the whole country is in a glow of legitimate pride and enthusiasm over the celebration of the great deeds of a hundred years ago. But their character indicates a coming period of pressure and counter-pressure such as Europe, much as she has suffered under the burden of armaments, has never yet experienced.

The effect of the German move was instantly felt throughout Europe. Russia promptly added on three army corps, say, 100,000 men, to her military forces. Austria-Hungary made provision for an extra 75,000 men to her peace effective. France, as the country most directly menaced by German preparations, at once took the supreme step of reverting to the three years' system of compulsory service and of voting a special credit of $100,000,000. For her the German challenge involved nothing less than the issue of life or death. With an army already considerably smaller than Germany's, with a population that has increased by barely ten per cent. while her rival's has increased by sixty-five per cent. in the past forty years, and inexorably condemned to face alone and at a moment's notice the first full shock of a German invasion, France had no option but to abandon the two years' service that she adopted in 1905. Only so could she make good her deficiency in numbers and confront the German hosts with a force not plainly inade-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quate to its responsibilities. Had the new German Army Bill come into force without any countervailing action on the part of France, the Republic would have found herself with nearly 350,000 fewer soldiers under arms than her principal antagonist. This ominous disparity could not be overcome by enlarging the area of enlistment, because France already drafts practically all her able-bodied men into the army and all exemptions and privileges were abolished by the law of 1905. It could only be overcome by a frank return to the three years' term of service. The French Ministry discussed all possible alternatives, but quickly, and by a process of exhaustion, reached the conclusion that this was the only feasible solution. The result of it will be to raise the French peace effective to some 700,000 (as against the German 800,000) and to place at the disposal of the Republic the largest possible number of the most efficiently trained troops—better trained, man for man, than the German forces. The only important exemption is a curtailment of from six months to a year in the service of youths in families of five or six children. Otherwise the new law applies indiscriminately to all physically sound Frenchmen and embraces retroactively the men who are now serving their two years with the colors. So stupendous a burden has never that I know of been shouldered by any nation in times of peace, and that it should be shouldered to-day by France, a democracy and a Republic, not only without any real opposition, but with alacrity and a great outburst of patriotic devotion, is surely one of the most remarkable phenomena of modern history.

The fact is that France for some years past has been undergoing a national and wholesome revival. The way in which she rebuilt her shattered fortunes after the war with Prussia, the ease and readiness with which she paid off the indemnity, the earnestness with which she remodeled her military forces, and the skill with which she safeguarded her international position were splendid but exhausting achievements. They left the nation drained. There was a time, and not so very long ago, when France seemed to dwell apart from realities in a soft and plausible dream-world, when national vigilance relaxed under the seemingly overwhelming guarantees of the Dual Alliance, when faction and corruption got the upper hand, and when a profound lassitude and pessimism had penetrated the popular

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mind. But always and before it was too late there has come the awakening. One might have thought, for instance, that after the Panama scandals the soul of France was dormant, if not dying. The national decadence seemed to be accepted as a clear if curious fact, just worth the trouble of analyzing and of tracing back to this cause and to that. The smiling genius of the land had passed, it appeared, into a total eclipse of hopelessness. It was a time when France, from sheer *ennui,* might have welcomed a Pretender. There came, instead, the Dreyfus case, probing and stirring the most heedless conscience, hurling men against naked realities, shattering parties, raising everywhere the extremes of fratricidal strife, but energizing the national character with a new will and steadfastness and evoking the display of the most heroic as well as of the basest qualities. The Dreyfus affair brought to a sudden head almost all the ills from which the country suffered. Thanks to its rough and radical surgery, she was able, after a supreme struggle, to throw them off. The ordeal wrought many changes in internal politics and external relations, but the greatest change of all was in the moral tone and conscience of France. It has not been by any easy road, and not without momentary panics and stumblings, that France has reached her present position of assured and confident strength. M. Waldeck-Rousseau did much for her; M. Clémenceau's Premiership did even more; it stiffened the national backbone, put heart into the Republic, and stopped the dry-rot that threatened to eat into the services; but perhaps the greatest instrument of French regeneration has been Germany and her policy in the Morocco question and the undisguised pressure she put forward to compel France to drop the *entente* with Great Britain. France submitted for a time, but when the provocation was repeated her nerves steadied themselves, she perceived that she must either cease to exist as an independent Power of the first rank or assert her freedom of action in unmistakable form, and throughout the Agadir crisis she faced and did not flinch from the imminent possibility of war.

From that moment France has never looked back. M. Poincaré's accession to office as Prime Minister in January of last year, and his more recent election to the Presidency, have quickened the national sense of a regained authority and power. There is now a more robust and realistic temper

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and mode of life in France than at any moment in the past four decades. Is it also a more Chauvinistic temper? I do not think it is. There is nothing provocative about it; and if Germany were to abandon her new Army Bill France would thankfully respond by an indefinite postponement of a return to the three years' service. It is true that one hears in Paris to-day a good deal more talk than there used to be about the chances of recovering the lost provinces, that the martial spirit is more in evidence, and that there are two plays running at the Paris theaters with war and Alsace-Lorraine and patriotism as their motive. But it is perfectly safe to say that outside the ranks of the inveterate Jingoes nobody in France desires war. Nobody, on the other hand, desires any repetition of the unpreparedness and the consequent humiliation when Germany pounced upon France in 1905. The national feeling is against aggression and adventure; but it is equally against a tame submission to a challenge or an insult. France demands of her Executive sufficient firmness to forestall or ward off the sort of treatment she has received, and been forced to submit to, from the hands of Germany more than once in the past few years. She has no thought of brusquely asserting herself in European affairs. But she is confident of her strength, she is self-reliant without bravado, and any attempt to hector or intimidate her would be promptly resented and repelled.

I do not myself believe that Germany meditates any such attempt. She is sufficiently cognizant of the changed situation to be aware that weapons which it was dangerous to use even five or eight years ago it would be sheer madness to employ to-day—unless, of course, which is scarcely credible, she deliberately intends to provoke Armageddon. What, then, is the net result of the pace she has set in the competition of armaments? Relatively the result is nil. The instantaneous counter-strokes of France and Russia leave Germany, so far as her two chief antagonists are concerned, precisely as she was. But her action has produced or seems likely to produce other and less negative consequences. Absorbed once more in her military problem, it is probable that she will be obliged to slacken off in her naval rivalry with Great Britain. Whether that will relieve the United Kingdom from participating in the gigantic increase of military armaments to which all Europe is now committed is a question that threatens to precipitate a sharp contro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

versy among British statesmen and publicists; and, indeed, the whole position of Great Britain, an island State, safeguarded by an apparently invincible navy, no longer capable of playing any very effective part in a Continental land war, but at the same time bound both to France and to Russia by somewhat indefinite ties of mutual interest and keenly apprehensive of all that a German victory over either Power would mean for herself, is one of singular and arresting anomalies. Meanwhile the piling up of armaments on this colossal and unprecedented scale fills all minds with a tense foreboding that they may prove as much an incentive to war as a preventive of it. Well over $1,500,000,000 is now being spent by the leading nations of Europe on preparations to wage war or avert it; and peace itself is in danger of becoming a luxury too expensive to be borne. That is an amazing commentary on the madness of the world in which we live, on the persistence of force in the midst of what we are pleased to call our civilization, and on the inexorable influence over the minds and actions of mankind which is still exercised by the idea of nationality. Americans, I imagine, viewing the spectacle which Europe presents to-day, would hardly for one moment be tempted to exchange their happy and remote security for the imminent contentions, the charged and sullen atmosphere, and the intolerable and wasteful burdens that oppress the older world.

SYDNEY BROOKS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REUNITING THE CHURCH

BY THE REVEREND HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK

THE most significant movement among the churches to-day, whether it be considered with reference to the causes which prompt it or to the results which are likely to follow it, is the campaign for federation and unity. The movement is significant if only in the striking contrast that it presents to the interdenominational spirit with which our fathers were acquainted. In serious controversy and sometimes in trivial squabbles, the differences between denominations used to be taken with a seriousness that projected their consequences into eternity. It is even to be feared that Ruskin's experience, the turning-point, as he calls it, in his revolt against the evangelical creed, could have been duplicated in many places in Europe and America. He writes in his vexation:

> "A little squeaking idiot was preaching to an audience of seventeen old women and three louts that they were the only children of God in Turin; and that all the people in Turin outside the chapel, and that all the people in the world out of sight of Monte Viso, would be damned."

And now, in a way that to our fathers would have seemed unbelievable, the dissevered sections of the Church are talking, praying, working, and perhaps most momentous of all, singing for unity.

The prevailing factors in this new movement for unity are the same forces which are reshaping all our modern world. The Church, as a mystical communion of the saints, may escape the compelling effects of democracy and science; but the churches as organizations, visible, corporate, and very human, can no more evade the transforming influences of the modern world than can the institutions of politics and business. Churches, as organizations, are the children of their age, and always have been. If to-day forty per cent. of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all Christians in the United States belong to communions democratically governed, it is not because in some independent moment of vision they saw their duty and did it, but because they have been constrained by the unevadable progress of popular rule. As in the democratizing of the churches, so in their unifying, Christians may guide the movement, but they neither caused it nor can they stop it. The forces which are making inevitable concentration, interdependence, and co-operation, dominate the modern age, and act upon churchly institutions with transforming effect as impartially as they do upon big business and international relationships.

One immediate effect of the rapidly changing social and intellectual environment in which the churches are set is to make obsolete many of the issues which divide the sects. The causes which launched the several denominations are all historic, many of them merely local, most of them without any lively interest for modern minds, so that wrangling churches to-day bear increasing resemblance to belated football-players, who continue an inconsequential scuffle, after the ball has been carried a long way down the field. How often do our modern denominations merely incarnate old national antipathies that were institutionalized into separate churches centuries ago, or old speculative theological controversies that to men now are quarrels between tweedledum and tweedledee! Only occasionally, at least among Protestants, does a denominational peculiarity coincide with a burning conviction of living men. The world has outgrown the causes which laid the boundary lines of the sects, and in large part, they are just about as important in modern life as are the boundaries of ancient Indian tribes in the present political system of Massachusetts.

Not only in general have the progressive forces of the modern world left far behind many of the ancient quarrels of the churches, but in particular, democracy and science, the two master powers of our age, are compelling the churches into federation. Old provincialisms, which depended for their existence on the isolation of small communities, inevitably disappear as science makes intercommunication easy, breaks down segregating walls, until far-sundered people are neighbors and allies. That there should be sixteen small Baptist bodies, all of which can be traced to local and temporary causes, and none of which has spread

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

far from its original habitat, is explicable in a day of segregated communities, but that these provincial dissensions, the outcome of a bygone segregation, should be perpetuated when the whole world is being made into a neighborhood, is to the new generation unintelligible. Only in the most remote villages of Scotland, and among the older people, will you hear the Celtic tongue still spoken; and the forces of our cosmopolitan civilization which drive out ancient and cherished languages and cause men to seek a common speech, are to-day, whether we will or not, making obsolete and untenable our denominational provincialisms. Real differences of conviction the new age can comprehend, but not twelve kinds of Presbyterians and eighteen kinds of Methodists in the United States. How many of our divisions are of this character! Without a single change in doctrine or polity," says Dr. Carroll in his *Religious Forces of the United States,* "the eighteen Methodist bodies could be reduced to three or four; the twelve Presbyterian to three; the twelve Mennonite to two." Let all the dissevered denominational families be reunited into single households again, and instead of one hundred and forty-three sectarian titles in the United States, we would have but forty-two. The differences, institutionalized in these subdivisions of the sects, are not now nor have they ever been truly representative of genuine and significant divergency of thought. They are the relics of old isolations, the vestiges of a bygone day before it could be said, "The nineteenth century made the world into a neighborhood, the twentieth will make it into a brotherhood."

With this unifying influence of the new cosmopolitan mind, democracy joins her prodigious power. Democracy insists on service as the goal and test of every institution. Even government has no value in itself; the divine right of a royal family to rule is gone; neither the glory of a king nor the integrity of a dynasty is a sufficient reason for any policy of State; all government has but one use, by the fulfilling or denial of which it stands or falls,—it must serve the people. This same transformation of ideals is taking place within the churches. Where once the propagation of a special creed, or the perpetuation of a ritual, seemed a sufficient *raison d'être* for a denomination, to-day all churches are subjected to a single test, a test at once Christian and democratic; they must prove their right to live

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the service that they render. Which is the True Church was once debated with opposing texts; now it is seen that the True Church will be picked out, not by arguments from the past, but by power to render service in the present. The True Church is being selected now by the survival of the fittest, and the law that governs the selection is an eternal one, "He that is greatest among you shall be your servant." As ministry to the real needs of men is thus emphasized as the objective of the Church, all speculative quarrels over niceties in metaphysics and all consuming interest in the perpetuation of a polity or ritual that makes no real difference to life, give way, gradually but certainly, before the desire to be of use. Men who could not and who should not in the interest of unity make any dishonorable surrender of cherished and significant belief, discover that men of most diverse beliefs can be united, not in creedal subscription but in practical service, not in doctrine but in deed. Church unity is not by any means a matter of our choice alone; it is being forced on us by the democratic test of service. The churches can co-operate in programme, if they cannot unite in creed, and democracy insists that they must—or die.

With the new cosmopolitanism breaking down the churches' provincial isolation, and with democracy forcing upon them the test of service, the scientific demand for efficiency adds the final necessity against which in vain the opponents of federation and union are struggling. In these days the whole world has been so opened to Christian missions, thus demanding an international Christianity, and the churches have been so faced with the call for lively social service, which cannot with impunity be refused, that the demand for efficiency has become overwhelming. What sectarian divisions do to effective religious work is obvious. The pathetic spectacle of little villages whose numerous spires suggest inexcusable competition, rather than religious aspiration, and where, as Professor Bosworth has said, the minister finds, "Not a field, but a hole," has become unendurable. Whatever the abstract truth may be about the importance of denominational differences, this situation, both true and typical, is manifestly wrong; a town with twelve hundred people, ten church buildings, ten denominations, fourteen congregations, ten ministers, and an average membership of twenty-nine per church.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If this spoiling of the Church's work by sectarianism is clear at home, it is even more evident upon the foreign field. What shall we say, when, to a traveler in the Himalayas, a turbaned Indian insists that he is not a Christian, but that he is a Scotch Presbyterian? What is the answer to the Japanese nobleman, crossing the public square at Tokio, who, urged to become a Christian, sweeps his hand about the square where a score or more missionary agencies have their homes and asks, "Which Christianity?" Not much longer can the churches retain their self-respect if they continue to expend millions in propagating in the Orient western sectarianism which the Orient does not need, the Orient's aversion to which is sufficiently indicated by a series of quotations from missionaries at the Edinburgh conference:

"'The Chinese are prepared to go a great deal further toward unity than the foreign representatives'; 'The best and most intelligent Chinese leaders are ahead of the average missionary in desiring one Church of Christ in China'; 'If the missionaries fail to come to the mark, I believe that the Chinese will speak out for union with no uncertain sound.'"

"If the Western shepherds do not look out," said a missionary recently, "the Eastern sheep will all be in one fold."

These great forces of science and democracy which make the Churches' old quarrels obsolete, her old provincialisms untenable, which compel her to prove her right to live by the test of service, and which judge her divisions by their influence on her efficiency, are felt a long while before they are analyzed. Their first effect upon churchmen is a slowly changing sentiment, where, without knowing why, folk feel that denominations are not as important as they used to be. To-day, within the churches, sectarian partitions grow so diaphanous, that recently a single church, out of thirty new communicants coming by letter at one service, welcomed representatives of seventeen different denominations. Denominational loyalty yields readily to convenience, to changed family relationships, to the attraction of personal friendliness, and even to the desire for social aggrandizement. When they are regarded most seriously, the separated churches are often looked upon as political parties are looked upon by independent citizens: they are expedients for the service of a cause, to be used when they are usable, to be reformed when they are wrong, and to be abandoned when they become hopelessly intractable. No longer are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they arks of the Covenant, each one claiming to enshrine the only hope for this life and the next.

If this increasingly is the attitude within the churches, the attitude of men outside the churches is forcing upon ecclesiastics, even when they are loath to see it, the unescapableness of the new situation. The more men are interested as are the wage-earners in campaigns for social righteousness which make a difference to life, the more men are concerned as are modern thinkers, with religious problems immediate and urgent, the more they turn away from an institution belated in its emphasis, provincial in its dissensions, and inefficient because of its sectarianism. In an age when men are tremendously in earnest, it is a tragedy that religion is represented by sects divided over issues about so many of which no one can be in earnest.

The answer which the Protestant churches have already made to the new situation is not by any means inconsiderable. On the foreign field comity between the sects increasingly is practised. In the Philippines, for example, no church works in another's territory, but, combined in the "Evangelical Union of the Philippine Islands," the denominations have so divided the ground that the Filipinos "scarcely know there is more than one Protestant Church." Hospitals like the one at Iloilo, jointly financed and managed by Baptists and Presbyterians; Medical, Normal, Arts, and Theological Schools of an interdenominational character now to be found in almost all the fields; and everywhere missionary conferences to promote fraternal co-operation, evidence the desire to escape competition and discover bases for union. At home the same sort of comity is being attempted when new territory is opened in the west. Actual amalgamation has already been achieved in whole or in part between churches thinly divided as were regular and Cumberland Presbyterians, or regular and Free-Will Baptists. Federations everywhere are being organized, from those founded for local purposes, to the more comprehensive "Federation of the Churches of Christ in America." Fraternal co-operation all the way from occasional affiliation, to great societies such as the Christian Associations, and extensive campaigns such as the Laymen's Missionary Movement and the Men and Religion Forward Movement, manifest clearly the new spirit of brotherhood. Even direct approaches to the main problem are being attempted as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the "Christian Unity Foundation," under the tutelage of the Episcopalians. And there is at least one Theological Seminary, one of our largest and best known, which owns no sectarian affiliation, requires of its professors no creedal subscription, and has on its faculty representatives of all the largest denominations.

Canada is giving to the churches one of the most enheartening exhibitions of the possibility of union. In a movement to incorporate the Methodists, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians of the Dominion into one body, the first two have already voted by overwhelming majorities in favor of the plan, and the last is waiting only until a substantial majority can be changed to practical unanimity. It is a clear certainty that soon there will be one church instead of three. Until recently four separate Theological Seminaries were maintained in Montreal by Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists. These four are now incorporated into one, and on the campus of McGill University a single building is being erected which will house them all. No one in touch with the strong currents of modern ecclesiastical life can fail to feel the irresistible set of the stream toward unity.

In the midst of our enthusiasm for church union, however, it is worth while for us to note that the modern movement which so inflames with a prophetic zeal the minds of liberal and progressive men is quite in opposition to the movement inaugurated by the liberal and progressive men of four centuries ago, and by them sustained at cost of martyrdom. In Milton's *Areopagitica* it was of sects and schisms he was speaking when he said:

> "What some lament of, we rather should rejoice at, should rather praise this pious forwardness among men to reassume the ill-deputed care of their religion into their own hands again. I fear that this iron yoke of outward conformity has left a slavish print upon our necks—the ghost of a linen decency yet haunts us. We stumble and are impatient at the least dividing of one visible congregation from another."

With all our zeal for union, therefore, it is well for us to search the possible iniquities of union, well to remember that union in Christendom is not an experiment untried. Once there was one organization and none other. Once all power was vested in one Church, and that power growing by what it fed upon and exaggerating its scope with the access of its authority, brought on the darkest days of Chris-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tendom. The pendulum's swing against union is as inevitable as the pendulum's swing toward it, if union be purchased at too great a cost, and the modern movement will come to wreck if it forgets the days when union, not schism, was the curse, when like smothered men who strike out for more room to breathe, the noblest spirits fought through schism to liberty and counted sectarianism the highroad to release. A chain-gang at lock-step is not God's idea of the Communion of the Saints.

Now the elements which made men like Milton rebel against conformity are present in to-day's situation. They are found in all proposals for union on the basis of a common creed and in all efforts to proceed forthwith to unite Christians in one organization. These two propositions commonly made to-day are plans that will lead to reaction, or else blind alleys that will lead nowhere. "We must all think alike" is a cry that will not rally modern men. "We must all join the same organization" is a proposal that will issue as did the Tower of Babel. "We must all work together for the Kingdom of God on earth, we must count the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy and faith, worth more than our mint, anise and cummin; we are all here for the same purpose, dedicated to the same work, servants of the same cause; we must co-operate and not compete"; this is the only open door that leads toward union. We cannot get together on a unanimous statement of belief, however simple; we cannot devise an artificial organization that will assimilate us all; but we can be welded on the anvil of a common purpose by the hammer of the human cry.

That co-operation in programme is the immediate step toward union is indicated by the history of Christian sectarianism. At first, the sects were bitterly hostile, counting rack and thumb-screw arguments none too strong to prove their points. From hostility the churches moved into the age of controversy, when words were the pillories and logic was the branding-iron—an age whose praises Lowell sang as he compared it with its predecessor:

> "And most of all thank God for this—
> The war and waste of clashing creeds
> Now ends in words and not in deeds;
> And no one suffers loss or bleeds
> For thoughts that men call heresies."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From controversy, then, into the age of toleration the churches moved, the age of the porcupine attitude between the dissevered sects, when racks and thumb-screws were all in the museums and joint debates on election and free-will had grown uninteresting, but when mutual suspicion everywhere prevailed, and aloofness and rivalry were common practices. And now from toleration we have moved into the age of co-operation, when the consciousness of a single mission holds increasingly the focus of the Christian thought, and in a programme of co-operative work to get the Christian tasks fulfilled, our differences gradually melt into fringes of our thought and tend to disappear. No one supposes that this age is the last. The vision will not down that a day shall come when the separated churches all shall gather, each with her contribution of well-guarded thought and life, to build the larger church that is to be,

> "When all names lost in one Name
> The Kingdom draweth nigh."

But to state the creed or frame the constitution of that future communion is not this generation's task. From hostility to controversy, from controversy to toleration, from toleration to co-operation, from co-operation to the spirit of unity, and from unity to union, that is the progress of the Church.

The proposal to proceed with the restoring of lost union on the basis of a common creed plainly involves the mistaken idea that intellectual disagreements in the Church are less than they used to be. On the contrary, no previous age ever saw such a diversity of thinking among Christians. To be sure, scores of old differences have become dead issues, as we just have said, and are to modern minds, as obsolete as the circumstances that gave them birth. There are old disagreements, however, which vitally persist, and to these are added new dissensions, of which the last fifty years have probably been more prolific than any other half-century in Christian history. In times when there are real grounds for various opinions, you cannot get unanimous subscription to a creed without a most ignoble, syrupy compliance. The differences to-day between the denominations are paling, but within the denominations the divergence grows. A liberal Presbyterian and a liberal Congregationalist understand each other well, but liberal Presbyterians and reactionary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ones make the record of their annual gathering read like the report of a fair in Killarney. As in political parties, so in the Church, the disappearance of the causes which laid the former party lines does not mean that one party is now to arise, but rather that new parties are in process of formation. If the present denominational boundaries do not represent our real differences, we must not be deceived into false hopes. When the break-up of the present alignment comes, it will probably not be into immediate union, but into a new arrangement of diversity, into modern differences expressed in institutions.

One way is commonly proposed by which to escape this difficulty. Creeds are symbols of worship, some are saying, not restrictive statements of belief. As an ancient hymn is unanimously sung, although its sentiments may be foreign to our experience and the theology which it expresses may be alien from our thought, so a creed is an expression of adoration, not an assertion of definitive conviction. But this will never do. It is one thing to sing a glorious hymn of praise, even when one recognizes that the theology that influenced its words is no longer held; it is another matter in the solemnity of a service dedicated to the God of Truth, in a sanctuary across whose threshold nothing that maketh a lie should ever come, to stand and say definitely "I believe," and then make a series of statements in which neither the minister nor one in ten of the congregation does believe. We have a churchman's authority for the principle that just as one may begin a letter to his enemy with Dear Sir, so a clergyman may recite the creed which he no longer believes, and that "as the custom of departure from the literal meaning of creeds grows, there is less and less guilt in unveracious subscribing." We have this same churchman's explicit application of his principle, for says he, "Among the most numerous sections of the clergy, nothing can exceed the contempt with which the Thirty-nine Articles are commonly treated"; and yet, "Before being ordained or licensed to a curacy, or instituted to a benefice, a clergyman is required to say, 'I, A. B., do solemnly make the following declaration: I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.'"* The question may be discussed as to how long a man or church frankly accepting such a creedal basis can retain public confidence; but there is no

* *The International Journal of Ethics*, January, 1897.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question whatsoever as to whether or not the churches can be united on that basis. The writers of these old creeds would not thank us for this treatment of them. Those reverend words were written because men did believe them, so seriously that stake and fagot could not discourage the conviction of their precise and imperishable truth. "Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled without doubt he shall perish everlastingly" was not written to be sung as a hymn. It is an obvious evasion and subterfuge when in any church the recitation of an ancient creed is perpetuated under the excuse that, while it is not an expression of present intellectual conviction, it is a symbol of worship, and to offer such a proposal as a basis for the reunion of the Church is to build a house on sand, against the day when the rains descend and the floods come. Already increasing multitudes of plain men, whose definitions of honesty are not perhaps sufficiently convoluted, have lost all patience with this pious fraud, and increasing numbers of clergymen are refusing to share in its unholy perpetuation. Too many Christians are convinced that "a church of make-believers would very soon beget a generation of non-believers," for them to allow the unifying of Christendom on the basis of creeds, sung as hymns, because they cannot be affirmed as convictions.

If the attempt to frame a new creed or to discover an old one, which shall be a basis for reunion, is a fruitless effort, so too is the attempt *de novo* to devise a compromise organization that shall comprehend us all. No one can attend conferences for the discussion of church union, however irenic and fraternal, without catching the note once voiced by a man who had quarreled with his friend. "We simply must be reconciled," he said, "and since I cannot be reconciled to you, you must be reconciled to me." In this road to unity by benevolent assimilation all sects believe.

The reason for this difficulty is deeper than any intellectual difference and is not to be ascribed simply to perversity. It lies in a realm of feeling not altogether ignoble. It is true that the churches have historic beginnings, in the causes of which we are not now vitally interested, but in the long course of the centuries associations have gathered, precious and beautiful to those who have been initiated into the knowledge and appreciation of them. Like old homesteads, they are flavored with the memory of ancestral joy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and sorrow, are made impressive alike by the tragedies and prosperities that have there befallen, and their hold upon the affection of their members is determined neither by the cause which launched them nor by the intrinsic value of their peculiar tenets, but by cumulative memories of ancient sacrifice and personal association, no less strong because often indefinable. All denominations have not only loyal members but casual adherents who feel for them a poetic rather than a rational allegiance, and poetic loyalty is often tenacious unto death.

This sense of community with the special movement in Christian history to which a man belongs does not prevent his entering with enthusiastic appreciation into the heritage of another section of the Church. He may even in this regard feel that Tennyson's sentiment is right,

> "That man's the best cosmopolite
> Who loves his native country best."

But this poetic allegiance makes impossible any extempore devising of a comprehensive organization that lacks the hallowing sanction of long history to give it power. The federal consciousness, the spirit of nationalism, has grown slowly in America, out of the confederation of the States, and in the Church as in the Nation, the retention of State boundaries, the doctrine of State rights, the cherishing of State traditions, even the bitterness of State jealousies, will long survive confederation for mutual defense and support. Confederation comes first; complete union afterward.

The fear is justified, therefore, that the immediate effort after a common statement of belief or a common polity may prove to be red herring drawn across the trail along which the real hope of union lies. If already the churches are so manifestly coming close together in a multitude of fraternal co-operations, the reason lies neither in the greater homogeneity of opinion nor in greater likeness of polity; the underlying reason is that with no less faith in immortality, the Church's emphasis is being shifted from the future life to this life, from postponed expectancy to present work, from interest in speculative theology to enthusiasm over her greater tasks, the building of moral character, and the social service of the people. By as much as this, her mission looms larger in importance than her differences of dogma and her dissimilarities of government by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so much is her unity made possible. A thousand differences of opinions, new and old, will make unanimity now, as hitherto, impossible, but the eager enthusiasms of the Church do not move in the realm where these dissensions lie. Rather her interest increasingly is centered around the sort of personal and social service that makes a real difference to human life, and with the increase of this stress on service, the unity of the Church grows in hopefulness and power. It progresses step by step with the shift of emphasis from speculative metaphysics to practical helpfulness, from eschatology to spiritual character and social righteousness. The one place where the churches to-day are actually coming together is neither creed nor polity, but work.

The enthusiasts for church union, therefore, will do the best service for their cause, by joining in the proclamation of a common campaign for the spiritualizing of human life, and in furthering every form of co-operation where the dissevered churches seek united effort on this their common task. As Great Britain's oppression was the unifier of the colonies so the social wrongs of this modern age, creating need for common defense and common aggression, must be the unifiers of the churches. When men of great wealth, selfishly obtained and selfishly expended say in spirit as Napoleon did, "I am not an ordinary man; I am an extraordinary man and ordinary rules do not apply to me"; when in a nation called Christian, men still work at grueling tasks twelve hours a day and seven days a week; when young children are sapped of all promise of a fine maturity by nights and days of exhausting labor at the loom until of many a man grown rich by their toil the prophet's word is true, "They sold a girl for wine and drank it"; when Senators buy their places as they do their automobiles and vice is by the guardians of the public made a source of profit, not an object of repression; and when at the dregs of it all young girls are sold into a slavery worse than death while still so young that they cry for their dolls; in the presence of conditions such as these from which the sensitive and philanthropic mind recoils blistered with shame and turbulent with indignation, of what value are our ecclesiastical divergencies of dogma and our peculiarities of polity?

The Task must be the unifier of the Churches.

Moreover, if the Church's mission to the individual is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clearly seen, in an age when men gain the whole world and neglect the springs of personal wealth and power which alone can make the whole world worth possessing, shall not her zeal for her redeeming mission, so greatly needed, make emphasis upon her differences seem ridiculous? For men now as ever can find no satisfactory interpretation for their lives except a spiritual interpretation, cannot think deeply, as Samuel Johnson said, without thinking religiously, and when their doubts are their only beliefs, and they live haphazard as they must, with lives quite uninterpreted, quite uninspired by any sure convictions, they lack not simply hope for the future but any basis also for positive endeavor now. To-day as in John Bunyan's time, Doubting Castle is kept by Giant Despair and his wife, Diffidence. If the Church has a message, therefore, well grounded in reasonableness and well authenticated in its effect on life, a message of assurance that the moral ideals are not mirages but realities, of valid and unconquerable hope that all sacrificial labor is a contribution which God uses and shall crown with triumph, a message that the principles of life exemplified in Jesus are not steam from a physical kettle, somehow automatically boiling, but the revelation of creative and eternal Spirit, let the Church tell men this, for this they need. These things are not man's luxuries but his necessities; not the banquet's macaroons and lady-fingers but the solid courses aimed at Life's elemental hunger.

This is the Task at home and in the islands of the sea and the Task must be the unifier of the churches.

Once let the idea take possession of the Christian people that they are not here to distribute passes to a future Heaven, but to help men begin now the kind of life that it would be worth while continuing in Heaven; let them be fully persuaded that they are not here to defend a speculative creed or to preserve a time-honored polity but to inspire men with a transforming faith in the spiritual meaning of life and to reconstruct society until it conforms with the implication of that meaning, and at once you will have at least this much union, that like the wheels of a watch, though some creeds go one way and some another, all will co-operate on the common task—to make the hands go round!

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIAL DECADENCE

BY SCOTT NEARING

It may be supposed, with what measure of reasonableness each reader shall judge, that no social group has ever existed which did not believe in its own integrity. On the other hand, history teaches, pretty conclusively, that there never was a social group,—China excepted,—which did not fall a victim of social decadence. Assyria, Carthage, Greece, Rome, the Italian City-States, and Spain, rose one by one to positions of wealth and power, became corrupt and decadent, and then fell easy victims to some virile, conquering people. Social decadence is a commonplace of history.

Can any such doctrine apply to the United States?

How absurd that question! There are the Declaration and the Constitution, guaranteeing freedom. There is the impregnable American home; the public school rears its bulwark of education; a network of industrial processes, heretofore undreamed of, supplies the wealth which we consume. Social decadence in the United States? Impossible!

How strangely history reiterates! So they all said. Yet, we laughed at Spain in 1898—Spain, the dreaded mistress of the sixteenth-century world. We commiserated with England over her wretched showing in the Boer War—England, the proud conqueror of Imperial Spain. Since 1905, when England received the report of her Parliamentary Committee on Physical Deterioration, we no longer wonder at her performance in the Transvaal. The investigations leading up to that report reveal low physical standards and a host of adverse social conditions threatening to send them still lower.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our own youthful society, dating back scarcely two centuries, is still virile, is it not? Yet as mortality is always highest during infancy, an examination of our social structure will not be amiss, and even though the facts be inadequate to prove beyond cavil the negative or affirmative of decadence, they may well be stated and considered.

Social standards are aggregations of individual qualities. Therefore, if the individual members of a society are of low type, the social standard must be low. On the other hand, the presence of a group of high-type individuals necessarily implies the existence of a high-standard society. Speaking by analogy, a society can raise its standard above that of its individual members as easily as a river can raise its level above the water-drops of which it is composed. Thus individual qualities constitute, in the aggregate, social standards.

Social decadence involves a lowering of the qualities of the members of a group; while social progress involves the reverse process. Since the object of the American people is progress,—the production of increasing proportion of individuals possessing that combination of physical and mental capacity, efficiency, sympathy, and vision which may be described as social worth,—it becomes necessary for them to inquire what factors may be relied upon to produce an increasing proportion of social worth, and what factors may, on the other hand, lead to social decadence.

If the qualities composing social worth are transmissible from parent to child,—even though it be by chance,—the social worth of any individual must be the product of heredity, of environment, or of a combination of these two forces. If heredity alone is responsible for these qualities, each generation may, by the character of its marriages, determine the extent of such special qualities in the succeeding generation. But even supposing that heredity is a negligible factor, and that environment is wholly responsible for their presence or absence,—the parent is still largely answerable because parental influences are everywhere dominant to the age of six, and in the upper income classes, for several additional years. A limited study of the transmission of human qualities and a wide experience with the transmission of special qualities in animals (for example, speed in horses) leads to the inference that ability among men may be consciously handed on from generation to gen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eration. Are these qualities the result of a careful training during babyhood and early youth? Are they the product of wise marriages? The answer is really unimportant to this discussion, for whether the associations of youth or the combinations of germ cells are to be held accountable for exceptional capacity, in either case the source of civic worth is parenthood.

The importance of this statement to the present question warrants some elaboration. The pioneer work in establishing the transmission of special capacity was done by Francis Galton, who estimated that the men who "have distinguished themselves pretty frequently either by purely original work or as leaders of opinion,"—*i. e.*, the geniuses,—constitute 250 (.025 per cent.) in every million men. The transmission of special capacity was illustrated by an intensive study of the judges of England from 1660 to 1865. On this study, Galton bases his estimate that the most gifted members of distinguished judges' families had 26 per cent. of genius among their fathers and 36 per cent. of genius among their sons. Thus, in the population at large 250 men in each million are geniuses, while of the fathers of the most distinguished judges 260,000 in a million, and of the sons, 360,000 in a million were eminent. So that the son of a distinguished judge is fifteen hundred times as liable to be eminent as is the son of an average man.[1]

Numerous other illustrations of the transmission of ability are available. An investigation of the genealogies of sixty-five eminent men of science shows that 26 per cent. of their fathers and 60 per cent. of their sons were eminent. That is a proportion among the sons of six in ten as contrasted with six in twenty-five thousand for England at large.[2] In one family,—the Darwins, beginning with Erasmus Darwin (1731–1802),—there have been in five generations sixteen men of scientific attainments.[3] The Bach family of musicians furnishes another remarkable instance of the transmission of ability. In eight generations (1650–1800) there were "far more than twenty eminent musicians," and the Biographical Collections of Musicians gives the lives of fifty-

[1] *Hereditary Genius.* By Francis Galton. London: Macmillan Company, 1892. (First edition 1869), pp. 6–9 and 74.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 188.

[3] *The Family and the Nation.* By W. C. D. and C. D. Whetham. London: Longmans, 1909, pp. 89–90.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seven. Tradition holds that the men married within the Musical Guild, hence both parents may have been musical. "It was a custom of the family to meet in yearly reunions at which the entertainments were purely musical."[1]

F. A. Wood's studies of heredity in royalty confirm Galton's work, leaving little question of the transmission of special ability from parent to child.

The same law holds with equal, if not greater, force in the transmission of defect. While it cannot be shown that ability is due to heredity alone, it has been definitely proven that certain defects are transmitted through the germ cell, and are, therefore, wholly hereditary. Feeble-mindedness, for example, is generally accepted as an hereditary defect. A recent New York study of families in which both parents were feeble-minded showed only two normal children in a total of seventy-five. In one Pennsylvania family with feeble-minded parents there are eleven children, all feeble-minded. All of the more recent studies of institutional records show that feeble-mindedness may usually be traced through several generations.[2]

While mental defect is clearly hereditary, other parental blemishes may, through heredity or environment, affect the offspring disastrously. Hæmophilia (bleeding disease) and Daltonism (color-blindness) are both distinctly hereditary. The same is probably true of deaf-mutism. The venereal diseases while not hereditary are most disastrous to the offspring. Pauperism, crime, and vice, surrounding childhood, likewise leave their impress on the physique and mentality of adult life.

Among the few studies of the transmission of anti-social qualities none is more striking than that of a notorious Indiana family *(The Tribe of Ishmael)*. In one branch of the family

"there were originally four children of whom two have been traced. William and Brook. William had three children who raised pauper families. One son of the third generation died in the penitentiary; his two sons in the fourth generation have been in the penitentiary; a daughter in the fourth generation was a prostitute with two illegitimate children. Another son of the third generation has a penitentiary record, and died

[1] *Hereditary Genius.* By Francis Galton. Pp. 232–4.

[2] *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics.* By C. B. Davenport. New York: Henry Holt & Company, Chap. III.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of delirium tremens. There have been several murders; a continuous pauper and criminal record. . . ."[1]

A similar and a far more complete study of defect was made in Europe by Dr. Jorger.[2] The Zero family, the subject of the inquiry, originated in a small Swiss valley, from which they spread their curse of criminality and pauperism over the adjoining territory.

"Parental irresponsibility, idiocy, and poverty have made this family for one hundred years a burden to the almshouse. The most persistent efforts have failed to raise the standard of the family, even in cases where the children were taken from their parents. This human product 'is a matter of selective breeding' from among the worst."

What social contrast could be more full of meaning than this between the Jukes family and the Jonathan Edwards family? On one side defect and social cost, on the other ability and civic worth have been handed down for generations.[3]

MAX "JUKE" (BORN 1720)	JONATHAN EDWARDS (BORN 1703)
1,200 descendants identified.	1,394 descendants identified.
300 in the poorhouse.	295 college graduates.
2,300 years in all.	13 college presidents.
300 died in childhood.	65 college professors.
440 viciously diseased.	60 physicians.
400 physical wrecks.	100 clergymen and musicians.
50 notorious prostitutes.	75 army and navy officers.
7 murderers.	60 prominent authors.
60 habitual thieves. (Averaged twelve years in jail.)	100 lawyers.
	30 judges.
130 convicted of crime. ("None of them ever contributed to social welfare." Their actual and potential cost to society was $1,250,000.)	80 held public office.
	1 Vice-President.
	3 United States Senators. ("It is not known that any of them was ever convicted of crime.")

Thus one family has produced twelve hundred social burdens or social scourges, while the other has given to the race nearly fourteen hundred social servants. One family represents social decadence; the other social progress. One field of tares, another of wheat lying side by side in the

[1] *The Tribe of Ishmael.* By Oscar C. McCulloch. National Conf. of Charities and Corrections, 1888, p. 156.

[2] *Hereditary Crime.* By G. C. Davenport, Am. Journal Sociology, Vol. 13, pp. 402–09 (1907–8).

[3] *The Jukes-Edwards.* By A. E. Winship. Harrisburg: R. L. Myers & Co., 1900, Chap. VIII.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same social area. Unlike the incident in the Scripture, the two do not grow in the same field, hence it is not necessary to wait until the harvest before attacking the tares.

Ability and defect may be the result of heredity through the germ cell or of environment through training, or they may be caused by both. In any case, they are not the product of chance, but are passed on through parentage from one generation to the next. The increase in ability or in defect is therefore determined by the qualities of the parents and the character of the training which children receive. Since parenthood plays so large a part in determining the qualities of the new generation, the birth-rates of different parental groups will be an invaluable indication of the source of the coming generation. Is it to the parents of high or of low social worth that the citizens of the future are being born? If those parents of the lowest social worth have the largest families the social decadence is inevitable. On the other hand, if the greatest number of children is born to those parents best fitted by heredity, training, and income, to care for them, social progress is assured.

The situation presents three possibilities. Either the proportion of high and of low social worth remains the same, in which case no progress is being made, or the increase in population is greatest among families of high social worth, which insures progress; or the families of low social worth furnish the greatest increase, which signifies decadence.

Any increase in social worth can therefore be assured only by maintaining the highest relative birth-rate in that portion of the population which represents high social worth standards. The facts at hand suggest that, in violation of this law, the population of the United States is increasing most rapidly from that group which is least fitted to transmit social worth to the coming generation. Whether through actual physical defect (feeble-mindedness, epilepsy, etc.) or through ignorance, poverty, or vice, a large group of American parents is unable to provide for children an heredity or an environment conducive to the production of high social worth. If, therefore, the birth-rate in this group of the population is relatively higher than in the group of greater civic worth, the population at large shows a tendency toward decadence.

The statistics which may be employed to demonstrate the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proposition contained in the last paragraph are, to say the least, unsatisfactory. Practically the only valid contrasts which can be drawn relate to hereditary defect, parentage, income, and scholastic attainments. No one of these tests is satisfactory, nor is their combination by any means conclusive. Yet native-born persons, with advanced education and comfortable incomes, are, on the whole, more competent to transmit social worth to their offspring than are foreign parents with less education and smaller incomes. The foreign-born have been classed as of lower social worth than the native-born group, because their lack of acquaintance with American customs renders them less desirable as child-trainers than the native-born; and because, employed largely at unskilled tasks, their incomes are wholly inadequate to rear a family of even medium size. Persons living below the poverty line may not represent low social worth in themselves, but they are certainly incapable of affording to their children adequate opportunities for normal development.[1]

The table on next page lends itself to certain generalizations. First. The data from Philadelphia, where excellent birth statistics are collected, show as clearly as may be the relation between social status and birth-rate. In the expensive residence wards, the rate is 18.0 per 1,000—barely enough to replace the population; in the great area devoted to small three-story and two-story houses, the homes of the "well-to-do," the rate is 21.4 per 1,000; among the American-born factory-workers the rate is 24.5 per 1,000, while in the lowest districts of the city, among the worst-paid immigrants, the rate rises to 41.9 per 1,000. (The variation in the death-rate is much less than that in the birth-rate; the death-rate ranges from 14.5 per 1,000 for the expensive residence wards to 20.5 per 1,000 for the slum wards.)

Second. In the population at large, the birth-rate is more than twice as high among foreign-born as it is among native-born. As present-day immigrants and low standards of life

[1] The reader should bear in mind that such statistics are in themselves nothing but generalizations. For example, the Philadelphia wards are not exclusively high-income or low-income districts. In fact, there is hardly a ward in Philadelphia which does not contain every type of domicile from a mansion to a shanty. So, too, the birth-rates are crude. No allowance is made for the sex or age of the inhabitants. Such figures merely confirm in a broad way the fact of common experience—large income, small family, and *vice versa*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A CLASSIFICATION OF BIRTH-RATES ACCORDING TO SOCIAL WORTH

HIGH SOCIAL WORTH LOW BIRTH-RATE		MEDIUM SOCIAL WORTH		LOW SOCIAL WORTH HIGH BIRTH-RATE			
Philadelphia[1] expensive-residence wards, per 1,000 population	18.0	Philadelphia two-story-house wards, per 1,000 population	21.4	Philadelphia (native-born) factory wards, per 1,000 population	24.5	Philadelphia (foreign-born) slum wards, per 1,000 population	41.99
COLLEGE GRADUATES[2]		*"Laboring Classes"*[3] *(Native-born)*					
Births Per Family							
Harvard (1872-77)	2.21	St. Louis	2.1				
Middlebury (1875-79)	1.8	Boston	1.9				
New York University 1870-74)	2.5						
Yale (1867-86)	2.02						
"Higher Classes" Per Family		*Native-born*		*Foreign-born*		*Defectives*[8] *Per Family*	
St. Louis	1.8	United States,[4] per 1,000 women fifteen to forty-four years	462.00	United States, per 1,000 women fifteen to forty-four years	710.00	Deaf mutes	6.1
Boston	1.8	Massachusetts,[5] per 1,000 population	16.58	Massachusetts, per 1,000 population	50.40	Insane	6.0
		Michigan,[6] per 1,000 women fifteen to forty-five years	111.00	Michigan, per 1,000 women fifteen to forty-five years	232.00	Criminals	6.6
		New York City,[7] per 1,000 females	28.26	New York City, per 1,000 females	109.46	Feeble-minded[9]	6.0

[1] Annual Report, Philadelphia Bureau of Health, 1908; Philadelphia, 1909, pp. 60-61.
[2] *Popular Science Monthly*, Vol. 63, p. 179.
[3] *Ibid*, p. 179.
[4] Census Bulletin No. 22, Washington, 1905, p. 23.
[5] *Modern Social Conditions*, W. B. Bailey, p. 104.
[6] Supra, p. 105.
[7] Annual Report, New York Department of Health, 1909, Vol. 2, p. 813.
[8] *World's Work*, Vol. 15, pp. 9821-2, 1907-8.
[9] A letter from Dr. H. H. Goddard (February 8, 1911). Records of 680 children based on 120 cases of feeble-mindedness in the institution at Vineland, New Jersey. Though there were six births per family, there were but four living children at the time of the study.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are synonymous, it is apparent that the greatest population increase occurs in a social group which is incapable of affording to children adequate opportunities. Among the native-born in New England there are indications of an actual decrease from generation to generation.[1]

Third. The birth-rate among college graduates is not sufficient to maintain the population static. The race of college graduates is dying out from generation to generation.

Fourth. Among the "higher classes," meaning "higher income classes," the birth-rate is lower than the rate among college graduates.

Fifth. The little available data indicates that the birth-rate among defectives is greater,—perhaps two or three times greater,—than that among college graduates.

The population of the United States is apparently increasing most rapidly among that group which has the lowest social worth. The largest families are found among the immigrants, the low-paid workers, and the defectives. Unfortunately, partly because of a lack of interest in the subject, partly because of the inadequacy of American birth statistics, no exact studies of the relative birth-rates of high, average, and low social worth have been made in the United States.

Perhaps the only reliable data is that contained in family records kept by institutions and the Eugenics Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island. In reply to a question on the subject, the director, Dr. Davenport, writes:

> "I have gained the general impression from looking up the pedigree of the offspring of parents, one or both of whom are mentally defective, that if their propagation is not interfered with, their families are larger than the families of Harvard graduates."

This fragmentary material is all that the United States affords on the subject.

In the course of the English studies, considerable data have been collected, among which are the following unsatisfactory figures of family size in defective families:[2]

	NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER FAMILY
Edinburgh degenerates	6.1
London mentally defective	7.0
Manchester mentally defective	6.3

[1] *The Declining Birth-rate.* By F. A. Bushel. *Popular Science Monthly,* Vol. 63, pp. 355–357 (1903).

[2] *Breeding Better Men.* By Raymond Pearl. *World's Work,* Vol. 15, pp. 9821–2 (1908).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

W. C. D. Whetham, an English social student, writes:

"From the study of 150 degenerate families Dr. Tredgold found that the average number of children in a family was 7.3, while the normal average for the country at large is 4. With the birth-rate falling in other classes, especially the most provident classes, the influence of a high rate of increase in feeble-minded families must mean the rapid and progressive deterioration of the race."

The most satisfactory and complete statement of the problem as it relates to England was made by David Heron in a study *On the Relation of Fertility in Man to Social Status*. After an intensive study of London Vital Statistics, the author concludes:

"As far as the present investigation goes, it demonstrates I think conclusively that for the London districts there is a very close relationship between undesirable social status and a high birth-rate. In districts where there is overcrowding, where there is a superabundance of the lowest type of labor, where it is needful to employ many young children in order to earn daily bread for the family, where infantile mortality is greatest, then the wives of reproductive ages have most children. Where there is more culture and education as shown by a higher proportion of professional men, where there is more leisure and comfort as shown by a higher percentage of domestic servants, where the traders, who appeal to the thriftless and improvident are fewer in number, there the birth-rate is least. Again, where there is more general pauperism, where signs of bad environment like phthisis are prevalent, where pauper lunatics are most plentiful, there the birth-rate is highest. . . .

"Nor is the birth-rate of the undesirable elements compensated by the higher death-rate. The net fertility of the lower status remains higher than that of the superior status."

These conclusions derived from English studies are not, of course, applicable to the United States, yet it is interesting to note that in a kindred racial stock, living primarily in towns and cities and engaged, like the Americans, in industrial pursuits, the group of lower social worth are largely responsible for replacing the population. Would a similar study in American cities yield like results? Certainly the American data already presented create a strong presumption in favor of the statement that the American population is being most rapidly increased from among those of low social status.

The available data clearly show that in the United States the well-educated and well-to-do portions of the population have a birth-rate (about two children per family) below that necessary to maintain the population. While it cannot be definitely shown that the defectives are propagating at a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

higher rate than the other classes of society, the data thus far would so indicate. On the other hand, it has been proven beyond cavil that the rate of increase among the immigrants is at least twice as great as that among native-born families, while among the lowest income groups the rate of propagation is several times as great as it is among college graduates and the well-to-do elements in the population. Here is evidence of a stationary population among those of high social worth, and a rapidly increasing population among those of low social worth.

The American population may, therefore, be increasing most rapidly from that group least fitted by heredity or by income to develop social worth in their offspring. The continuance of such a condition must inevitably mean the replacement of the more able by a less able stock. Such a process of "reversed selection" must mean, for the nation, a constant decrease in the social worth of each succeeding generation.

SCOTT NEARING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONSERVATION OF FUR SEALS

BY GEORGE ARCHIBALD CLARK,
SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR

On July 7, 1911, there was signed in the city of Washington a treaty between the United States, Great Britain, Japan, and Russia which suspended for fifteen years the hunting of fur seals in the open sea. Had this treaty not been signed, Canadian sealers would to-day be pursuing our fur seals off the California coast and Japanese sealers would in like manner be hunting the seals of Russia, off the coasts of Japan; while in the summer both fleets would unite on the American herd in Bering Sea.

The fur seals have their breeding home in Bering Sea, the American herd on the Pribilof Islands, in the eastern portion of that sea, the Russian herd on the Commander Islands, near the coast of Kamchatka. With the approach of winter they leave the islands for a long migration down through the Pacific Ocean, the American herd to the latitude of Santa Barbara, the Russian herd along the coast of Japan. The downward journey is rapid, the return trip slow, occupying the later winter and spring, and bringing the animals back to their island homes in the latter part of May and early June.

It was the custom of the Indians of the vicinity of Neah-bay, Vancouver Island, and Sitka to go out in their canoes to hunt the stragglers from the herd on the northward journey which came near enough the shore. In 1879 or thereabouts sailing-vessels began to be used to take out the Indians and their canoes, caring for them at night and in time of storm, and enabling them to follow the main body of the herd. The sealing-vessels gradually anticipated the arrival of the herd off the Strait of Fuca by going south to meet it, until finally they came to await it at the turning-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point of its migration, off the Santa Barbara Channel. The principal port for this sealing was Victoria, B. C., but vessels at times sailed from San Francisco, Monterey, and San Diego.

Pelagic sealing proved very destructive to the herd. It respected neither sex nor condition of the animals found, and the catch fell principally upon the gravid and nursing females, the latter taken upon the summer feeding-grounds in Bering Sea; for when the migration route of the seals had been covered the sealers entered Bering Sea and lay in wait for the mother seals as they visited the fishing-banks one to two hundred miles distant from the islands for the purpose of feeding. As a result of the death of the mother the dependent young starved to death on the rookeries. In the fall of 1896 sixteen thousand fur-seal pups died of starvation on the rookeries of St. Paul and St. George islands.

As pelagic sealing developed through the increasing number of ships, its catch grew from 8,000 at the beginning to a maximum of 140,000 in 1894; but this could not last, and with the declining herd the pelagic catch also began to decline. In the season of 1911, the last of the industry, the catch numbered about 15,000 skins. In 1893 the United States and Great Britain reached an agreement in the matter of pelagic sealing which provided for a protected zone of sixty miles radius about the breeding-islands and a close season of three months—May, June, and July. These were binding upon the Canadian sealers, but when the Japanese fleet entered Bering Sea in 1903, they were not bound by this agreement and conducted their operations throughout the summer from the three-mile line with even more destructive effect.

From the known catch of the sealing-fleets and from conservative estimates as to animals killed but not recovered, it is apparent that more than a million breeding female fur seals and a like number of unborn and dependent young were destroyed during the thirty-odd years the pelagic industry has been in operation. The result is the depleted condition in which we find the herd to-day. Our best information places the number of the animals in the herd at the time we took it over from Russia in 1867 at between two and three millions. It numbers to-day about 215,000.

The cause of the herd's decline was, for a considerable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time, a matter of dispute between the United States and Great Britain, but in 1897 a joint conference of fur-seal experts, after two seasons of investigation on the breeding-islands, agreed upon the killing of females inherent in pelagic sealing as the sole cause of the decline and upon the abolition of pelagic sealing as the sole remedy. This required international action and it has taken fifteen years to bring about the desired end, which was accomplished by the treaty of July 7, 1911.

This treaty was a bargain involving give and take. Great Britain and Japan, whose citizens maintained the pelagic industry, agreed to its abandonment. The United States and Russia, owners of the fur-seal herds, agreed to share the product of their land-sealing industries with Great Britain and Japan in reimbursement of their citizens. The percentage of the land catch agreed upon was fifteen per cent. to each nation.

The land sealing concerned in this arrangement is the killing of the superfluous young males, or bachelors. The fur seal is polygamous, the average harem for the season of 1912 numbering sixty females to one male. The sexes are practically equal in the birth-rate of any season. Through fear of the adult males the younger males herd by themselves on separate beaches, beyond the confines of the breeding-grounds. From these beaches they are driven inland, a sufficient reserve for breeding purposes marked and set aside, and the rest killed for their skins. This process of land-sealing has been in operation throughout the period of American control, forty-two years, and the United States has received in royalties from the leasing companies approximately $10,000,000 for sealskins taken and marketed by them. If pelagic sealing had not intervened to reduce the herd, the income of the Government in the past twenty years would have amounted to $1,000,000 annually. If the treaty of July 7, 1911, is maintained, the herd will in the next fifteen years—the life of the treaty—have practically recovered its condition of maximum prosperity.

The doubt as to whether this treaty will be allowed to affect its beneficent work of restoration arises from the fact that in the law of August 24, 1912, designed to give effect to the treaty, a suspension of land sealing for five years was provided for. Thus for five years Congress has placed us

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the position of having no land catch to share with Canada and Japan. These nations are dissatisfied and are protesting. Japan has already paid $560,000 to extinguish the sealing rights of her citizens, which they yielded up unwillingly. The Canadian sealers have been settled with by Great Britain on some effective basis. In the season of 1912 there was absolutely no pelagic sealing. It is an open question whether the patience of these people will survive the five-year period. The industry they yielded up was a valuable one and had taken approximately 300,000 animals from the Pribilof herd in the past fifteen years. These skins were marketed by the sealers at an average price of $15 each—a total of $4,500,000. The pelagic sealing nations would seem to have reasonable ground for withdrawal from the treaty. Such withdrawal would be followed by resumption of pelagic sealing, and the ultimate destruction of the herd.

The effect on the treaty, while the most serious consideration, is not the only one. It is not merely possible to remove the superfluous males, but such removal is necessary to the best development of the herd. The breeding life of the animals is at best crowded. The adult bulls are powerful and pugnacious animals of 400 to 500 pounds weight. The cows are animals of about 80 pounds, and the young are comparatively helpless at birth, weighing about 12 pounds. An overstock of males leads to fighting and commotion in the breeding season with consequent injury to the females and their young. The law suspending land sealing, if carried through, will inflict, during the next fourteen years, a stock of 75,000 bulls upon the fur-seal rookeries, of which 63,000 will be wholly superfluous, and the fighting of these bulls will bring heavy damage to the breeding stock. It may be added that these 63,000 animals will have borne, at the age of three years, skins worth to the Government, and to the treaty nations, $40 each, or approximately $2,500,000, a clear loss, as the skin of the male seal is commercially worthless after the fourth year of its age.

An incidental but none the less important effect of the suspension of land sealing will be the decimation if not the complete destruction of the blue-fox herd, an important fur-bearing asset of the Pribilof Islands. These animals through a century of habit have come to depend on the offal of the killing-fields for their winter supply of food. This is to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cut off for five years. The animals cannot migrate. As is their custom when food is scarce, they will prey upon one another, the strong eating the weak, the adults the young. It is possible to feed the animals with dried salmon, whale meat, beef—but it will be a difficult and expensive matter, and the law makes no provision for it.

The suspension of land sealing, as provided for in the fur-seal law of August 24, 1912, is an unnecessary, even harmful measure. It should be repealed at as early a date as possible.

GEORGE ARCHIBALD CLARK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MENACE OF PAN-ISLAMISM

BY ALBERT EDWARDS

THIS story is making the rounds of the British army messes. An official report on the matter is, doubtless, on file in the archives of the War Office in London.

The scene was a military post in the Sudan. There were half a dozen white officers and their families, a company of English soldiers for use as a model, twenty extra "drill sergeants," and a regiment of native troops. They were the "Fuzzy Wuzzies" of Kipling's verse plus several years of drill and armed with modern rifles instead of spears. Outside the barracks there was a cluster of squalid mud huts and beyond miles and miles of desert, the killing African sun—the unspeakable heat.

One day a native private ran amuck. Perhaps it was the heat, perhaps he had been drinking infidel alcohol, or it may be that something snapped in his brain. With all the vivid invective of the East he began to insult an English captain who chanced to be crossing the parade-ground. Why should a follower of the Prophet take orders from an infidel slave? The day was approaching when the Ingleesi dogs would be driven into the sea. The land would be cleaned of their pollution. Were not the lives of the handful of white men in the keeping of the soldiers? Were not all the regiment members of The Snoussïa? Sworn to the Holy War of Extermination? Did not the Great Sheik promise that the day was at hand?

Intoxicated by his own anger, the mad Arab attacked his officer, wounded him slightly, might have killed him if he had not been overpowered by some English soldiers and dragged to the guard-house.

That night at mess the officers discussed the matter. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

younger ones dismissed it as "a touch of the sun." But all agreed that a summary example must be made of the "nigger" who had struck a white officer. It is not on record what the native soldiers said as they discussed the incident.

In the morning a court-martial was mustered in state. Every one was in dress uniform, all the flags were up, for ceremony is supposed to impress the "native" mind. The English company was drawn up behind the bargee where the court sat. The native soldiers were ordered to their barracks to watch English justice from a respectful distance. When the stage was properly set word was sent to bring out the culprit. As he was being led across the parade-ground, between two English soldiers, a shot rang out from a window in "C" Barrack. The bullet went through the prisoner's head, killing him instantly. The English officers and all the company of English soldiers had seen the puff of smoke from a particular window. The fifty native soldiers in that room solemnly swore that their officers' eyes had deceived them. They took Allah to witness and swore by the beards of their fathers that no shot had been fired from their room. An examination showed that a gun-rack had been forced—one of the rifles was still hot. The natives, however, insisted that there was some mistake. The rifle which had been used belonged to a private who was detailed as gardener to the colonel's wife. At the time of the murder he had been docilely pulling up weeds under her direction.

One of this half-company of Mohammedans had fired that shot; all must have seen it done, but all with one accord stubbornly denied any knowledge of the matter. And there the mystery rests!

There is only one plausible explanation—the consequences of which no one is willing to accept. All of those men may have been members of the great secret order of the Snoussïa; its rulers may punish with death any one who reveals its plans. Its discipline may be so perfect that all that half-company were willing to submit to severe punishments rather than tell what they knew. But if this half-company were Snoussïa, how about the rest of the company, how about the rest of the garrison? And how about the other Mohammedan regiments under English officers in the Sudan, in India, in Egypt, Algeria, and Tunisia? This

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chance—that Europe's colonial troops may be disloyal—is the menace of Pan-Islamism.

Hardly a day passes that the newspapers of Europe do not contain much information on this subject. In one issue of a London daily I found half a column on the Mohammedan unrest in India, the report of a Pan-Islamic conference in Egypt, a despatch from Russian Turkestan about a fanatic who had been arrested for preaching the Holy War, and an official French telegram from Lake Tchad about a new "general order," intended by the military authorities to discourage some agitators of the Order of Derkawa who were stirring up trouble among the blacks of that district. A Paris paper of the same date reported that "The Mad Hamdushi," whom the police had been seeking for several months along the southwest border of Algeria, had been found dead in a village near Taza. The Italian raid in the Tripolitaine and the recent overwhelming defeat of the Turks have revived the subject. Most of the European reviews have published articles relating to it. But it is only by going to the native press, to the Arabic publications, and by study of the countries affected that one can get a general idea of motives back of all these diverse manifestations.

Broadly speaking, Pan-Islamism is the idea of uniting all the followers of Mohammed. But for what purpose? By what means? Before these questions the dream of unity at once breaks down. There are three distinct and mutually hostile elements in the Pan-Islamic movement.

First there is the Mohammedan "Old Guard." They have been entirely unimpressed by modern history. They are intellectual reactionaries, who have learned nothing and have forgotten all that knowledge which once made them powerful, all the science and art which was the glory of the Great Caliphs. The "black" ecclesiastical coterie at Rome is wildly progressive compared to them. They are true to the old traditions which destroyed the library at Alexandria twelve centuries ago. All the truth of the world is in the Koran; everything not in that sacred book is false.

Like all fanatics, they are visionary. They take no thought of practical ways and means. They attribute the decline of Islam to the sins of the people. If they would only return to the primitive purity of their religion, Allah

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would draw his sword and the career of conquest which marked the early days of Mohammedanism would return. Their only weapon is faith.

The headquarters of this faction—it has no definite organization—is in Mecca. There every year pilgrims from the ends of the earth come under the influence of these fanatics. And emissaries from this center are abroad through all the length and breadth of Islam. It is a passionate missionary crusade such as the world has not seen for centuries. The apostles of this revival beg their way in poverty and in the face of great suffering along the tracks to China, Siberia, India, the Sudan, Central Africa, and Morocco. Everywhere the people receive them as holy men and listen to their preaching with awe. No man can judge the extent of their influence. It is easy to dismiss them as ignorant fanatics. But the world has seen many momentous things done in the name of Ignorance and Fanaticism.

The second faction of the Pan-Islamists is as far removed from the first as one group of men well could be from another group. Its inspiration comes from the "Europeanized" Mohammedans. Its leaders have studied in the Sorbonne, at Oxford, or at least in one of the many European schools which have been established in the Levant. Most of them are—although they might not admit it—Free Thinkers. They have lost their faith in the divine Mission of Mohammed, but they consider that some religion is necessary for the masses, and they prefer the undiluted Monotheism of their fathers' creed to any of the more hazy theologies of Europe. In the same way, although they have been taught to see the stupidities and abuses of their own civilization, they prefer them to abuses and stupidities of ours. They dream of rejuvenating the lands of Islam after the manner of the Japanese. They would break down the dead traditionalism which smothered the intellectual life of their people; they would restore the great days of Bagdad and Granada and graft upon this ancient glory a few such modern conveniences as sanitary sewer systems and railroads. The best of the Egyptian and Indian "Nationalist" movements, the cream of the Young Turks and of the Persian "Constitutionalists" belong to this faction. Although some of their followers now and then throw a bomb, they are men of thought rather than of action. It is by reason and not by violence that they hope to realize their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dream. They have no hostility toward Christian nations, and, once their own independence was gained, they would hope for cordial relations with peoples of other creeds.

Disinterested observers—that is, practically every one but colonial administrators—sympathize with this group of Pan-Islamism. They are the leaven of progress in the Mohammedan world. Unfortunately they have received a serious blow in the utter collapse of the Young Turk movement. The inability of their followers in the Ottoman Empire to govern wisely has discredited them everywhere, has given a new argument to European colonialists in their contention that the Mohammedans are unfit to manage their own affairs.

The other section of the Pan-Islamic movement is less clear-cut in outline. It is marked by a bewildering mixture of crude fanaticism, mysticism, and European culture. Its partisans differ from the first group in their keen interest in such practical things as rifles and military training, from the second in the sincerity of their religious life and in their belief in the arbitrament of war. The writings of the Egyptian Nationalists bear a marked resemblance to, are full of quotations from, the pamphlets of the French Encyclopedists. The Order of The Snoussïa—to which the mad native soldier of the English garrison referred—is the standard-bearer of this third faction, and the book of its founder resembles nothing in the literature of Christendom except some of the writings of the medieval Anabaptists and the more frenzied of the Russian Mystics. There are pages on end given to the description of the various stages of ecstasy which lead to the desired consummation of complete oneness with God. In the first stage the adept will see seven million green stars of surpassing loveliness; in each succeeding stage there will be different colored stars, until in the final stage before reaching the ultimate bliss of oblivion the disciple beholds constellations of a glory for which there are no mortal words. It is difficult to find anything in the volume which is really intelligible to a Westerner.

And yet the Snoussïa—one of the youngest of the religious orders—is the strongest. Founded in 1848, it has already distanced all other similar organizations and is growing apace. It unquestionably owes its popularity to the wide-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spread belief that it is making practical preparations for the Holy War.

So far at least the differences in ideals of these factions have prevented any united action. And there can be no real Pan-Islamism until these differences are dissolved or until one faction swallows up the other two.

From the point of view of immediate politics the colonial administrators of North Africa and India are most interested in this last section of Pan-Islamists, who are not only talking about a militant rebirth of Mohammedanism, but are also actively preparing for it. But it is very hard to get credible information. The only sure fact is that no infidel knows with any certainty what is happening. The French in North Africa are divided into two camps: those who believe that a Holy War is a serious and imminent menace and those who scoff at the idea. The subject is taboo in the military clubs because it almost always precipitates a quarrel. The "believers" call the "scoffers" "blind fools" and are answered by the epithet "timorous." My personal experience leads me to believe that the majority of the French who have lived long enough in the country to know the language do not scoff. They may not lose sleep over the specter, they may not—very few do—believe that Pan-Islamism will triumphantly drive the French flag from Africa, but they do not scoff at the possibility of serious trouble.

There is the same difference of opinion among the English officers and administrators in Egypt, but the question is not so bitter among them. Their unquestioning faith in "Anglo-Saxon luck" keeps them from worrying. "We put down the Sepoy rebellion in India," one of them told me, "we smashed Mahdi, and we can do it again." But the reconquest of India was a horribly expensive thing, and Gordon was not the only Englishman whose life was lost before they smashed the Mahdi. But the English are so used to living on the edge of a volcano that they have lost the habit of worry.

In North Africa the question of Pan-Islamism is wrapped up in the development of the religious fraternities. The Snoussïa, to which reference has been made, is the most powerful, but it is only one of a hundred. These secret orders are in a way heterodox. There is nothing about them in the Koran. "There is no God but God" was the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formula of Mohammed. Again and again in different phraseology he repeated the assertion that God has no partners. He claimed for himself the mission of prophet, but he always insisted that he was a man like other men. He did not offer to act as intermediary; he established no clergy. The religious life he taught was a direct, personal relation between the individual and the Deity. But very few people feel themselves pure enough or sufficiently brave to go alone before the tribunal of God. Intercessors seem to be a human necessity. And so—just as the cult of the Virgin grew up within Christianity—innumerable saints have appeared in Islam.

The more revered ones became—at first unintentionally—the founders of orders. The oldest of all is the Khaderïa. Unley-Abdel-Khader, who lived in the twelfth century of our era, was a holy mystic, bearing a close resemblance in his practice and teaching to St. Francis d'Assisi. He did not seek nor expect the canonization which succeeding generations gave him. But from the small group of his disciples grew a great order. It has divided and subdivided, but in almost every Islamic community there are some who hold the name of Unley-Abdel-Khader in almost idolatrous veneration. The same thing has repeated itself again and again. The great majority of the present-day Moslems find the reality of their religious life in one or another of the orders.

Most of them have a somewhat similar organization. In the mother chapter, generally built about the tomb of the founder, the Sheik of the order has his headquarters. Frequently a lineal descendant of the saint, the Sheik always claims to share his Baraka, or divine blessing. He rules a court not unlike that of the Vatican, one minister having charge of the doctrines, another of propaganda, a third of finance, and so forth. Affiliated chapters, or Zawïas, are scattered as widely as possible and each is ruled by a Mokkadem. He is always a man under the personal influence of the Sheik and stands before the local brethren as his half-divine representative. Every effort is used to incite the generosity of the members. Perhaps one-third of the funds collected goes to the support of the local Zawïa, one-third sticks to somebody's fingers, and the rest goes up to the central treasury.

However, it is impossible to generalize about these orders.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No two are alike in doctrine or practice. The Tidjanïa have made peace with the Mammon of Infidel Unrighteousness. The present Sheik, whose headquarters are in Algeria, is practically a French official. He openly wears the cross of the Legion of Honor. During the last winter he traveled extensively in Morocco. Nominally on a pastoral visit, in reality he was sent by the French to urge his Moroccan followers to accept the protectorate without resistance. Most of the Tidjanïa are men of consequence. As far as I can discover it is more of a rich man's club than a religious order. Unley Ali, the present Shareef of Wassan and the head of the Tabbïa order, was educated in a French school in Algiers and speaks most easily the language of his mother—an Englishwoman. The French are also relying on his great influence in the difficult task of pacifying Morocco. The Derkawa, who in Morocco represent the extreme fanaticism of the Mecca coterie and who preach not only war against the infidel, but revolt against all corrupt Moslem governments who have made peace with the Christians, have practically no treasury. They do not beg except for food, and refuse money. They devote themselves entirely to religious propaganda. They seem insane, but they certainly are not mercenary. The Snoussïa, on the other hand, have developed as efficient a money-raising system as was ever invented. Their Mokkadems are expert blood-suckers. It means financial ruin to join this order. But it is growing more rapidly than any other. The people believe that the money goes to prepare for the war against the infidel.

Naturally, the colonial governments have spent much money and energy trying to inform themselves about this threatening order of Snoussïa. But very little is known. The first Sheik—Si Mohammed ben Si Ali ben Snoussi—was a strange mixture of the apparently idiotic mysticism of his writings and of great practical organizing ability. He founded the mother chapter in the Tripolitaine and his following grew rapidly; the more devout of his recruits emigrated from Egypt and Tunisia—polluted by infidel governments—and in the desert hinterland of Tripoli dug wells and founded communities about these artificial oases. As far back as the Mahdist uprising in the Sudan, which resulted in the death of Gordon, the Snoussïa were a power to be reckoned with. Even the Iron Earl of Cromer heaves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a sigh of retrospective relief when he reaches the place in his memoirs where the old Sheik refused to join forces with the Mahdi. Two sons have succeeded to the control of the order. The one who carries on the quasi-diplomatic relations with Europeans is said to be a sensual weakling, enervated by debauch, and frankly cynical about religion. It is impossible to get definite information about the other brother, who, according to native rumor, is the real head of the order.

It is also known from circumstantial evidence that the Snoussïa encourages its members to enlist in the native regiments and get training in the ways of European warfare, and that a constant pilfering of arms and ammunition goes on in almost every native regiment. There are, I think, very few police officers in Egypt or Tunisia who would question the statement that the Snoussïa could put into the field " several " thousand troops, drilled by European officers, abundantly supplied with arms and ammunition, and supported by some artillery. How many thousand? Two? Ten? Twenty? It is only a guess.

So much is known about this vast secret society. The rest is conjecture. For more definite information, for answers to the thousand questions this little knowledge stirs, there are nothing but native sources. The Mohammedans who are not members know no more about the order than the infidels do, and the members will not tell. But there are abundant rumors.

Two army officers—one French, one English—have shown me on the map the spot in the unexplored desert along the Egyptian-Tripolitaine border where they believed the Snoussïa have their principal depot of arms. So far no European has penetrated to this oasis. The mystery of Mecca has been dissipated by Christian explorers, but this alleged stronghold of the Snoussïa has not yet been visited. Perhaps it does not exist. But many sober-headed people believe that it does. I have often heard the story—supported by the best reputations for veracity—of strange rifles which are sometimes found in the interior. High-power, modern repeating rifles which do not bear the trade-mark of any European manufacturer. Native rumor says that there is a great arsenal in this mysterious oasis where Mohammedan graduates of Western technical schools are manufacturing arms and ammunition against the great day.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It sounds like a fairy story—from Japan. This fact, however is sure: no one knows the military strength of the Snoussïa.

But this is not the real danger. Supposing that these rumors are facts, that the mysterious brother of the "official" Sheik of Snoussïa should proclaim the Jehad and produce an army of fifty thousand well-drilled, well-equipped fanatical soldiers. It would undoubtedly be a serious affair, but not beyond the power of either England or France. The burning question is, How far can the native troops be trusted? Would the Egyptian troops march against the new Mahdi? Would the superb Spahis, who make so gay a show before the Government House in Algiers, obey their infidel officers? If they simply mutinied passively, it would be bad enough. But if they marched off to join their brothers in revolt, it would be the worst catastrophe Europe has ever faced.

However, it is certain that the overwhelming majority of European residents of North Africa do not fear the Holy War. They find an element of safety in the very number of religious orders. "The Dominicans and Jesuits never hated one another the way these rival Mohammedan sects do," one man told me. He was a Syrian Christian, educated in the Mission College in Beirut; he had traveled widely in Europe and was at the time editing an Arabic newspaper in Tangiers, which was subsidized by the French Government and almost entirely boycotted by the Moors. Arabic was his native tongue; he had mastered the Moorish dialect and so was in a position to know what he was talking about. He told me at length of the bitter jealousy between the rival Sheiks; he was sure that there was no chance of their uniting. And even more important than their mutual hatred was—he thought—their venality. He told me the amounts which the French Secret Service is paying annually to some of the "saints" in return for their political support.

"Europeans cannot understand these people," he said; "they are utterly corrupt. At least the aristocracy is—the leaders. And the common people are utterly ignorant. They have no feeling of nationality—nothing like what you call 'patriotism.' They have only a vague, superstitious fanaticism. Pan-Islamism?" He shrugged his shoulders in contempt. "If all their spiritual leaders united in pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

claiming the Jehad, the people would follow them without doubt. But I tell you they hate one another too much. There is no ' communion of saints ' in Islam; they send one another poison. And then most of them are for sale. If a new Mahdi sprang up, he would attract attention at once. If he could not be bribed, he would be suppressed, and it would be one of the big Sheiks whose prestige was threatened by the upstart who would hand him over to the Europeans. But there will never be a new Mahdi. It is cheaper and simpler to buy them before they gather enough followers to fight.

" Then there is the question of language. Turks and Persians and the Arabic-speaking people will never unite. Even Arabic is not one language. Here in North Africa alone there are dozens of dialects—a Moor can't understand an Algerian. The only really warlike people are the Berbers of the mountains. Their language is not even remotely related to Arabic. Besides, the Mohammedans as a people are unarmed. The rifles they buy from gun-runners are low grade and inside of a year are too rusty to work.

" They are split up into little tribes, with all the jealousy of tribal organization, different dialects and customs, rival Caïds. There is no more political or racial unity than there is of religious unity. Pan-Islamism is a story to frighten children. The Mussulmans are corrupt to the core—it is their religion. Every leader, Cadis, Ulema, Caïds, and Marabouts—all are for sale."

As he finished his statement—we were seated at a café table in the Socco Chico of Tangier—one of the begging brothers of the Derkawa passed through the crowded, multicolored market-place crying aloud with monotonous repetition the name of God. If ever any people in the world looked " disinterested," it is these apostles of old Islam. His rags were not affected, his holy poverty was real. He looked a lineal descendant of the hermit saints of the Thebaid. The light of insanity—or of an overmastering religious faith—was in his eyes.

" Can you buy that man?" I asked.

" He probably is not worth it. If he has been in town two hours, the police know all about him. If he cannot be bought, well, look." He pointed across the way to a grizzled, sunbaked French officer who was sitting in another café reading the latest paper from Paris.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"You mean," I said, "that if you cannot buy him you can kill him?"

"Pooh!" he replied, contemptuously. "It is seldom necessary to do more than scare them."

This I think is a typical expression of the optimistic, most common attitude—a contempt for the native and great faith in the military power of Europe. But there is always the other side to be remembered; the earnest, serious men who are not optimistic about it.

All that can be learned from talking with Europeans of North Africa is that a serious and vehement difference of opinion exists about the danger of a Pan-Islamic revolt. The crux of the matter is the question of whether or not the varied tribes of the Mohammedan world, speaking different dialects and languages and the varied religious sects, with their rival leaders, can unite. It certainly does not seem probable. But less than a twelvemonth ago a man who is supposed to be exceedingly well informed on European diplomacy, who for years has been an authority on the Near East, told me that the national jealousy between Servia and Bulgaria was so great that there was not the remotest chance of a Balkan federation!

It is rather appalling to think out what a Pan-Islamic revolt would mean. A new Sepoy rebellion from the Red Sea to the Atlantic. A score or more of isolated European garrisons in Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco besieged by the same wave of fanatic courage which overwhelmed Gordon. The seaports around the coast from Suakin to Mogador would be dependent not only for protection, but also for food, on the European navies. The necessity of relieving the inland garrisons would imply the speedy organization of a dozen odd military expeditions, at least as large as that which Kitchener led—too late—to Khartoum.

What would the Powers of Europe do in the face of such a crisis? Mohammedanism is too threatening in India to allow the withdrawal of troops from that quarter. England would be dependent on her minute home army and what help she could draft from her Anglo-Saxon colonies. Russia would be kept more than busy with her own immense Mohammedan population, her Persian and Turkish frontiers. France, with her great North-African empire, would be denuded of troops. It would bankrupt her. England might

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weather the storm in India and Egypt. But for France it is a simple matter of arithmetic. For the years between the bombardment of Casablanca and the establishment of the protectorate last year, France has been spending fifteen thousand dollars a day on her military operations in Morocco alone, and in that period there was very little serious fighting. A war from Tunis to Tangier—a real war—would be inevitable bankruptcy.

And the balance of power in Europe? Germany and Austria alone of the great nations would be unaffected by a Mohammedan revolt. With the military power of her chief rivals strained to the utmost, could Germany be expected not to attempt to gain her coveted "place in the sun"? A wide-spread Holy War might well mean the bankruptcy of Europe.

ALBERT EDWARDS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PILLAR WORK

BY RICHARD BURTON

"And upon the top of the pillars was lily-work; so was the work of the Pillars finished."—I Kings, VII, 22.

Among the flowers, the lily blooms supreme
For light and loveliness; her odorous breath
Floats like the memory of some delicate dream,
After her body has gone down to death.
Of garden growths she is the fairest one;
She crowned the Temple built by Solomon.

Behold the task completed! Marble strength
And ornament of precious stone were there,
But, for to make it lovelier, at length
They wrought a work of lilies, passing fair,
And set it high atop, like a great gem
To glow and glitter in Jerusalem.

The strength that flowers in Beauty is twice strong.
Four-square the Temple stood; but when the eye
Looked cloudward, lo, like to a lofty song,
The lily-work made glad the Orient sky;
And all the worshipers grew hushed, and peace
Fell on their hearts, and heavenly release.

Richard Burton.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE "GITANJALI": OR SONG-OFFERINGS OF RABINDRA NATH TAGORE

BY MAY SINCLAIR

"But what are they all about?" a friend asked me when I tried to tell him of the "Gitanjali" of Rabindra Nath Tagore.

"They are all about the passion of the love of God," I said.

"Oh, devotional poetry. There is nothing easier to write than devotional poetry," said my friend.

I wondered, is he thinking of "Hymns Ancient and Modern," of the "Olney Hymns," and of "The Christian Year"?

In any event he had raised between us such an alienating vision of the banalities and facilities in which our unhappy youth was nursed that I forgot to remind him of the Psalms of David. And it was altogether impossible to speak of the "Gitanjali," the "Song-offerings" of Rabindra Nath Tagore.

It was not many weeks since I had heard these poems for the first time, that evening when Mr. Yeats turned Mr. Rothenstein's drawing-room into a holy temple by reading a dozen or more of them to about a dozen people. Even now, though they would all of course agree that what had happened was, for Literature, an event of supreme importance, they are probably no nearer than I am to knowing precisely what it was that happened to *them*. The thing was an experience too subtle, too profound, and too personal to be readily translatable into language. And so it would have been impossible to write about it in any words that would hang together if my friend had not supplied that slender thread.

For deep-seated in his mind was the conviction that de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

votional poetry is not and cannot be pure poetry; a view which might be plausible enough if you had nothing but the "Olney Hymns" or "The Christian Year" to compare with, say, the choruses in "Prometheus Unbound" or "Atalanta in Calydon."

You may go farther. You may take Newman's "Lead, Kindly Light," which is devotional poetry (of the kind my friend was thinking about) at its finest. It is poignant; it is passionate; it expresses in language which is profoundly disturbing the supreme need and longing of the human heart. But set it beside pure poetry at its purest, beside Shelley's "Life of Life, Thy Lips Enkindle," or Swinburne's "The Hounds of Spring are on Winter's Traces," and you see at once that if "Lead, Kindly Light" is poetry it is not altogether pure. It follows a certain devotional tradition. It calls upon emotions long and intimately associated with certain images. You cannot be quite sure that its poignancy does not depend somewhat on associations and accessories, on the voices of the choir, the organ music, and the light fading on a summer evening from stained-glass windows. Shelley's and Swinburne's songs are so pure from all association and so nakedly radiant that they evoke no image but the movement of light itself or of the shining feet of Artemis; they move us by their own subtle and intense vibration or they move us not at all. They have not the power that Newman's hymn has to touch the common human heart.

In the Bengali poems of Rabindra Nath Tagore you will find that common emotional appeal united, in a music and a rhythm many degrees finer than Swinburne's—a music and rhythm almost inconceivable to Western ears—with the metaphysical quality, the peculiar subtlety and intensity of Shelley; and that with a simplicity that makes this miracle appear the most natural thing in the world. As far as I know no Western poet yet born has done precisely this. Not Milton; he is far too grandiose for the human heart. Not Wordsworth; he is at once too subtle and too ponderous. And not the great mystic poets of the West, for they are the poets of mystics, as Shelley is the poet of poets; not Crashaw and not Francis Thompson, nor Henry Vaughn nor Blake at his simplest. Not even Dante and St. John of the Cross, though they stand nearest (they are very near) to this great mystic poet of Bengal. For the songs

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the "Gitanjali," the purest of pure poetry, written in the Bengali vernacular, are sung all over his native province; they are sung in the churches of the Brama Somaj. You cannot sing any of those great mystic poems of the West in church. And if you could they would not be understood by the congregation.

To the Western mind there is a gulf fixed between the common human heart and Transcendent Being. That is partly why, with the exception of the works of the great mystics and the seers, the devotional poetry of the West (Catholic and Protestant alike) is so unsatisfying. Most of it is written by people who are not poets. But the worst of it is that it is not supremely devotional. It does not deal directly with the Transcendent, but proceeds, fervently indeed, but always by way of dogma and tradition, as it were by perpetual makeshifts, and through the most horrible tangle of material and carnal imagery, to a visionary Throne of Grace. You never seem to arrive. Your heart may be soothed by the assurance of atonement; but your finer metaphysical hunger is left forever unappeased. And your poetic sense receives at every turn the impression entertained by my friend that devotional poetry is not difficult to write.

But take these songs of Divine Love from the "Gitanjali":

> "Art thou abroad on this stormy night on thy journey of love, my friend? The sky groans like one in despair.
>
> "I have no sleep to-night. Ever and ever again I open my door and look out on the darkness, my friend!
>
> "I can see nothing before me. I wonder where lies thy path!
>
> "By what dim shore of the ink-black river, by what far edge of the frowning forest, through what mazy depth of gloom art thou threading thy course to come to me, my friend?"

> "In the deep shadows of the rainy July, with secret steps, thou walkest, silent as night, eluding all watchers.
>
> "To-day the morning has closed its eyes, heedless of the insistent calls of the loud east wind, and a thick veil has been drawn over the ever-wakeful blue sky.
>
> "The woodlands have hushed their songs, and doors are all shut at every house. Thou art the solitary wayfarer in this deserted street. Oh, my only friend, my best beloved, the gates are open in my house—do not pass by like a dream."

> "The day is no more, the shadow is upon the earth. It is time that I go to the stream to fill my pitcher.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The evening air is eager with the sad music of the water.

"Ah, it calls me out into the dusk. In the lonely lane there is no passer-by, the wind is up, the ripples are rampant in the river.

"I know not if I shall come back home. I know not whom I shall chance to meet. There at the fording in the little boat the unknown man plays upon his lute."

"I was not aware of the moment when I first crossed the threshold of this life.

"What was the power that made me open out into this vast mystery like a bud in the forest at midnight!

"When in the morning I looked upon the light I felt in a moment that I was no stranger in this world, that the inscrutable without name and form had taken me in its arms in the form of my own mother.

"Even so, in death the same unknown will appear as ever known to me. And because I love this life, I know I shall love death as well.

"The child cries out when from the right breast the mother takes it away, in the very next moment to find in the left one its consolation."

With what supreme simplicity the Bengali poet bridges the great gulf!

His simplicity, his restraint, his austerity, will be a little disconcerting to those who are accustomed to think of Oriental poetry as a thing of ungovernable efflorescence, smothered in decoration, crusted with gold and jewels, and specially and disgustingly rich in sensual imagery.

But as the East is subtler than the West, and as of all Eastern races the Bengali is the subtlest, so an extreme subtlety of feeling and of rhythm is the first quality that strikes you in the songs of this Bengali poet. This will damn them in the mind and to the ear of every Westerner who measures feeling by blood pressure and rhythm by the strokes of a sledge-hammer. To the average European, subtlety is a synonym for intricacy and obscurity, for the refinements of chicane, and for a certain insinuating sensual charm. The European writer, when he is subtle, is frequently sensual where he is not intricate and obscure, while the subtlety of the Eastern poet makes for transparence and simplicity. And a supreme transparence and simplicity is what you will find in every line of Rabindra Nath Tagore. It is the simplicity, the transparence of dew and crystal and still water. As a mystic he is bound to be a symbolist. But his phrase, his rhythm, is infallibly the most perfect,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the most crystalline medium of his symbol, his symbol the most crystalline and perfect medium of his thought. The result is an incomparable unity of rhythm and language, of language and idea.

It is not the least of his marvelous achievements that he should have preserved this quality in his translations. In his own language he had an absolutely flawless medium. "Bengali," says Mr. F. H. Skrine, "unites the mellifluousness of Italian with the power possessed by German of rendering complex ideas." English most certainly does not, but Mr. Tagore has almost persuaded it. I am told by those who know these poems in the original that this prose rendering, apparently so unerring in its sense of phrasing, of sound values and vibrations, fails to give the slenderest, most shadowy idea of the beauty of the Bengali, its richness of association, its diaphanous texture, its glamour and its musical quality, the plasticity, the subtlety, the variety of its rhythms. I have heard some of the songs of the "Gitanjali" sung and recited by the poet himself and by others. At the first hearing the rhythms, the pitch, were strange, almost unseizable by Western ears; sounds tenuous and remote and disconnected like the buzzing song of a swarm of gnats. On the second and the third hearing their music and their magic was apparent.

Though this strange music is lost to us, Mr. Tagore's translation preserves, not only all that is essential and eternal in his poetry, but much of the strange magic. Indeed, the substance of it is of such supreme value and vitality that no translation could have killed it. Like the poetry of his own Vedas and Upanishads, it would have survived even the glamourless rendering of a scholar. Above all, its simplicity and its transparency survive; for they are of the substance of this poet's vision. The whole complexity of things, the veil of *Maya,* the illusion of the world, is simple and translucent to him, so simple and so translucent that Reality is neither hidden by it nor obscured. That wearing of the veil of illusion is the jest of the Divine Lover hiding himself from his beloved that he may be the more passionately desired.

> "It is he who weaves the web of this *maya* in evanescent hues of gold and silver, blue and green, and lets peep out through the folds his feet, at whose touch I forget myself.
>
> "Days come and ages pass, and it is ever he who moves in my

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heart in many a name, in many a guise, in many a rapture of joy and of sorrow."

And in the poems of this mystic the world appears no longer in its brutality, its vehemence, its swift yet dense fluidity; it is seized in the very moment of its passing and fixed in the clarity and stillness of his vision. It is always the same every-day world, the dusty road, the deserted street, the solitary fording, "the bank in the shady lane" where "the yellow leaves flutter and fall." "In the deep shadows of the rainy July thou walkest, with secret step, eluding all watchers." At the coming of the Unknown Traveler "The leaves rustled overhead; the cuckoo sang from the unseen dark, and perfume of *babla* flowers came from the end of the road." A world vivid to every sense, yet the stage of a supersensual drama, the scene of the divine adventure. So vivid and so actual is it, that only its strange fixity stirs in you the thrill of the supersensual.

And through this fixity, this stillness of rhythm and of mood, there is a mysterious trouble and excitement, an awful tension of expectancy. It is the stillness of intense vibration, of life inconceivably living, the ecstasy of supreme passion consummated and consumed.

No. There is nothing in the Western world to compare with these poems but the writings of those mystics who were also saints: St. Augustine, St. Thomas à Kempis, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Julian of Norwich,[1] St. Catherine of Genoa,[2] St. Teresa; and, above all, St. John of the Cross in "The Dark Night of the Soul":

> "Upon my flowery breast,
> Wholly for Him and save himself for none,
> There did I give sweet rest
> To my beloved one;
> The banners of the cedars breathed thereon!"

All these impassioned lovers of the Godhead use the same language, telling of the same unique experience; and it is invariably the language of human passion, for the simple

[1] "Till I be substantially oned to Him I may never have full rest nor very bliss: that is to say, till I be so fastened to Him, that there is right nought that is made between my God and me."—*Revelations of Divine Love.*

[2] "My *Me* is God, nor do I recognize any other *Me,* except my God Himself."—*Vita.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and sufficient reason that there is no other.[1] At the same time, with the exception of Dante's *Paradiso* and *Vita Nuova,* it would be hard to find in all the poetry of Western mysticism a perfect parallel to the passion of the "Gitanjali." There are few Western mystics who do not somewhere betray the restlessness that lies around their rest. Until the final attainment of the Unitive Life their peace would seem to have been harder won, to be held more perilously, to be always on the point of passing, so vivid is the sense they give of effort, of struggle, of frantic desperation. There is a corresponding vehemence and violence in their language. St. Teresa says of the state of the enraptured soul: "No consolation reaches it from heaven, and it is not there itself; it wishes for none from earth, and it is not there either; but it is, as it were, crucified between earth and heaven, enduring its passion." Again she speaks of "the great shocks I used to feel when our Lord would throw me into these trances." And again:

> "It is like a person, who having a rope round his neck tries to breathe." "On other occasions the soul seems to be in the utmost extremity of need, asking itself and saying, 'Where is Thy God?'" "I saw myself dying with a desire to see God, and I knew not how to seek that life otherwise than by dying. Certain great impetuosities of love, though not so intolerable as those of which I have spoken before . . . overwhelmed me." "This prayer is like the sobbing of little children, who seem on the point of choking and whose disordered senses are soothed by giving them to drink." "Some slight mitigation may be had, and the pain may pass away for a little, by praying God to relieve its sufferings; but the soul sees no relief except in death by which it hopes to attain the fruition of its good. At other times these impetuosities are so violent the soul can do neither this nor anything else; the whole body is contracted, and neither hand nor foot can be moved; if the body be upright at the time it falls down, as a thing that has no control over itself. It cannot even breathe; all it does is to moan—not loudly, because it cannot; its moaning, however, comes from a keen sense of pain."

Again, an angel appears to her in a vision.

> "I saw in his hand a long spear of gold, and at the iron's point there seemed to be a little fire. He appeared to be thrusting it at times into my heart, and to pierce my very entrails; when he drew it out he seemed to draw them out also, and to leave me all on fire with a great love of God."

[1] "As a young man yearns for his beloved, even so the soul yearns for God; it is for want of a better object of comparison that the Vaishnavists worship the Lord under this form."—*Chaitanya Devi.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of St. Catherine of Genoa it is said that "at times she would seem to have her mind in a mill; and as if this mill were indeed grinding her soul and body."

> "She would at times, when in the garden, seize hold of the thorn-covered twigs of the rose-bushes with both her hands; and would not feel any pain while thus doing it in a transport of mind. She would also bite her hands and burn them, and this in order to divert, if possible, her interior oppression."[1]

St. John of the Cross speaks of "an intense and amorous impetus," answering to St. Teresa's "impetuosities."

And at times the language of the Catholic mystic is the language of sensuous, almost of sensual, emotion, so voluptuous that it must be confessed it lends itself to the misinterpretation of the profane. Mr. Tagore has none of these ambiguities. It is impossible to doubt the spirituality of these songs of Divine Love. They are at the very highest level of attainment in their kind. They have the serenity and purity of supreme possession. Mystic passion embraces while it transcends the whole range of human passion. Like human passion it works through body, heart, and soul. It is the soul and heart of passion that you find in the "Gitanjali," its secret and invisible things, small and great, all in it that is superb, inviolate, undying; all that is lowly, and most fragile; its impalpable, incommunicable moods, its evanescences, its dreams, its subtleties, its reticences and courtesies; its fears and delicate shames.

> "I asked nothing from thee; I uttered not my name to thine ear. When thou took'st thy leave I stood silent. I was alone by the well where the shadow of the tree fell aslant, and the women had gone home with their brown earthen pitchers full to the brim. . . . I heard not thy steps as thou camest. Thine eyes were sad as they fell on me; thy voice was tired as thou spokest low, 'Ah, I am a thirsty traveler.' I started up from my day-dreams and poured water from my jar on thy joined palms. . . . I stood speechless with shame when my name thou didst ask. Indeed, what had I done for thee to keep me in remembrance?"

And again:

> "Where dost thou stand behind them all, my lover, hiding thyself in the shadows? They push thee and pass thee by on the dusty road, taking thee for naught. I wait here weary hours, spreading my offerings for thee, while passers-by come and take my flowers, one by one, and my basket is nearly empty. . . . Men going home glance at me and smile and fill me with shame. I sit like a beggar maid, drawing my skirt over my face, and when they ask me what it is I want, I drop my eyes and answer them not."

[1] *Life of St. Catherine of Genoa.* By Baron von Hutten.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is no querulousness and no grossness of impatience, no restlessness in this passion of the expectant soul.

And on the part of the pursuing God there are none of those impetuosities that overwhelmed St. Teresa. He comes "with silent steps." He is the lover waiting in the shadows. He is the watcher by the bed, the solitary wayfarer in the deserted street, the traveler at the well; he is Krishna, the lute-player, the "unknown man" playing in the little boat at the fording. I know nothing so persuasive as the glamour of this Eastern stillness, nothing that evokes so irresistibly, so inevitably the sense of the Unseen. You will find it in its perfection in the sixty-seventh song of the "Gitanjali."

> "Thou art the sky and thou art the nest as well.
> "O thou beautiful, there in the nest it is thy love that incloses the soul with colors and sounds and odors.
> "There comes the morning with the golden basket in her right hand bearing the wreath of beauty, silently to crown the earth.
> "And there comes the evening over the lonely meadows deserted by herds, through trackless paths, carrying cool draughts of peace in her golden pitcher from the western ocean of rest.
> "But there, where spreads the infinite sky for the soul to take her flight in, reigns the stainless white radiance. There is no day nor night, nor form nor color, and never, never a word."

Before this supreme austerity and restraint all foregoing comparisons break down. There is, through all their likeness, an unmistakable difference between those great Western mystics and Rabindra Nath Tagore.

Their passion utters a more poignant lyrical cry. They experience a more violent rapture in union, and a deeper tragedy in separation. Nothing could well be farther from his spirit than their emotionalism. Individual temperament has no doubt something to do with it, but it is not the whole secret. This tumult and tragic pain of theirs has its own law. It displays itself in proportion to their asceticism, to the violence of their rupture with the divine visible world. It is the outcome of the dualism inherent in Christianity.

To the devotee of a Creator inconceivably different, infinitely remote and separate from his creation, the visible world is necessarily undivine, abhorrent, and unholy. In renouncing the world the Eastern ascetic denies its exist-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence. But the Christian, in the very act of renunciation, affirms its shocking independent entity. Thus his deliverance is never either physically or metaphysically complete. That is the Christian's tragedy. He cannot without an agonizing struggle get rid of the world that weighs on him, whereas it is comparatively easy for the Oriental to divest himself, as it were, of his cosmic clothing. It is doubtful if any Eastern ascetic, Brahman or Buddhist, could feel the same furious hatred and horror of the world, seeing that to him the world, the whole visible universe, is at its worst no more than an illusion. You may refuse to become attached to an illusion, you may withdraw from it with every circumstance of profound repudiation, but you cannot furiously hate and abhor a thing which, for you, has no real existence of its own.

In the "Gitanjali" you will find none of this hatred and abhorrence, none, either, of this serene indifference and denial.

> "Deliverance is not for me in renunciation. . . . I will never shut the doors of my senses. The delights of sight and hearing and touch will bear thy delight."

"What divine drink," he cries, "wouldst thou have, my God, from the overflowing cup of my life?" And again:

> "The same stream of life that runs through my veins night and day runs through the world and dances in rhythmic measures.
>
> "It is the same life that shoots in joy through the dust of the earth in numberless blades of grass and breaks into tumultuous waves of leaves and flowers."

"Is it beyond thee," he asks, "to be glad with the gladness of this rhythm, to be tossed and lost and broken in the whirl of this fearful joy?" To him the life of God is an "abounding joy that scatters and gives up and dies every moment." It is the life of humanity as human:

> "Here is thy footstool and there rest thy feet where live the poorest and lowliest and lost.
>
> "Leave this chanting and singing and telling of beads! Whom dost thou worship in this lonely dark corner of a temple with doors all shut? Open thine eyes and see thy God is not before thee.
>
> "He is there where the tiller is tilling the hard ground and where the path-maker is making roads. He is with them in sun and in shower and his garment is covered with dust. Put off

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thy holy mantle and even like him come down on the dusty soil. . . . Our master has joyfully taken upon him the bonds of creation; he is bound with us all forever."

Everywhere in these poems there is this acceptance of humanity, this ecstasy of joy in movement and in beauty, this adoration of life.

"Let all the strains of joy mingle in my last song—the joy that makes the earth flow over in the riotous excess of the grass, the joy that sets the twin brothers, life and death, dancing over the wide world, the joy that sweeps in with the tempest, shaking and waking all life with laughter, the joy that sits still with its tears on the open red lotus of pain, and the joy that throws everything it has upon the dust, and knows not a word."

It looks at first sight as if this all-embracing mysticism were different in its very nature from the view of the Catholic recluse prisoned in his cell. And yet it has even less affinity with Indian mysticism of the Pantheistic type. And this is a little disconcerting. Surely, you say, there must be things in the Upanishads from which some at least of these poems are descended? You take down your Upanishads and hunt through them excitedly for those things, but in vain; unless you are prepared to accept wholesale the interpretations of the ingenious Ramanuja[1] who contended that even in union with Brahman the individual self maintained its separate identity. And it is only now and again in the "Gitanjali" that there comes any reverberation of the mystic words "Tat tvam asi" ("Thou art it") of those resonant and resplendent passages which proclaim the absolute, inseparable unity of all things, of all selves in the Great Self.

Everybody whom the magic of the Upanishads has delivered from the tyranny of German transcendentalism must feel for them something of that tender adoration which Schopenhauer expressed when he said the study of them had been the solace of his life and would be the solace of his death. They certainly satisfy, as nothing else (not even the Hegelian Dialectic) satisfies that appetite for meta-

[1] The point raised is not whether Ramanuja was wrong in his doctrine, but whether he was right in his interpretation of his texts. Certainly, if Max Müller has translated them correctly (with the possible exception of an ambiguous passage in the Katha Upanishad), they generally seem to be saying the exact opposite of what Ramanuja wants them to say.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

physical unity which was so profoundly repellent to the instinct of Mr. William James; and I can imagine that people possessed by that appetite will be disappointed when they find that they cannot label Mr. Tagore "Pantheist" or "Buddhist" and have done with him. And when he tells them that "all ages pass with the hiding and seeking of thee and me," they will resent it almost as if no Oriental had any right to insist on a personal relation involving a breach of identity between the soul and God.

Now, the metaphysician may deny or affirm that identity as his appetite or his instinct prompts him. Nothing can be more certain than that, for the mystic, the personal relation is everything. It is an experience, a fact. All the same, it and the separation it implies, is an experience, a fact, that begins and ends in his own individual consciousness. It is irreducible, indescribable, incommunicable. Metaphysically it stands for nothing more or less than that moment in which the human soul becomes conscious of itself in God. The thing is duplex only in one aspect. Around it, continuing in it and transcending it are all the unity, all the identity you can desire. The separation is not real, not absolute, any more than death or birth is; it is part of the illusion, part of the great game, "the hiding and seeking of thee and me."

> "It is the pang of separation that spreads throughout the world and gives birth to shapes innumerable in the infinite sky.
>
> "It is this sorrow of separation that gazes in silence all night from star to star and becomes lyric among rustling leaves in rainy darkness of July.
>
> "It is this overspreading pain that deepens into loves and desires, into sufferings and joys in human homes, and this it is that ever melts and flows in song through my poet's heart."

To find Mr. Tagore's true sources and affinities you must go back, first of all, to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; to Kabir the mystic; to the great Vaishnavists who were the Humanists of India; to Chandidas the poet; to Chaitanya Devi, the God-intoxicated saint and seer. All of them are said to have been influenced by the Christianity that found its way into Central India in their time. Before them there is Ramanuja. But going back further still, as far back as you *can* go, you find this naïf personal attitude in the Vedic Hymns. The ancient Rishis, as lamentably as any Christian, felt their "self" to be separated from their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deity or deities by the fact of sin. It was those who came after them, the more philosophic Rishis of the Upanishads, the Buddhists who came after *them,* and the expert metaphysicians of the Vedânta, who reversed this view and found sin in the illusion of separation. And all the later mystic poetry of India, from Kabir onward, springs from the conflict and reconciliation between that immemorial feeling of separation and that profound and supersensual certainty of oneness. This indeed is the source of all the mysticism that ever was; only in India the feeling of separation is the baffling thing; the supersensual certainty is taken for granted, while in Christianity it is all the other way. In India it is simply a question of whether you are going to agree, say, with Ramanuja that the individual soul preserves its identity in union, or with Sankaracharya that it has never had any identity to lose.

Kabir, conscious of the separation, conceives union as a mingling in which the soul is certainly not lost. "The soul (âtma) and the Great Soul (Param Âtma) for many ages remained apart; the true Guru (teacher) came as a dealer (*dallah,* middle-man) and made of them a beauteous mixture." "The power that cannot be described, the form that imparts life, whoever becomes one with him (as milk with water) that man, says Kabir to Dharm Dass, Kâli cannot destroy." "Thou art the ocean; I am the fish of the water": he says, "I dwell in the water, without the water I am done for." But he does not say he is a dewdrop and that he slips into the shining sea. And though he protests "Whatever I did, you did; I did nothing myself; should men say I did it, it was in your strength that it was done," he makes it clear that he preserves his separate identity all the same.

In the Vaishnavists[1] this feeling for the individual soul is strong, and in Vaishnava literature it comes into its own.

Chandidas broke with tradition and showed how thoroughpaced a Humanist he was when he called his beloved, Rami, the washerwoman, "Holy as the Gayatri," the Sacred Hymn of the Brahmans which is the holiest of all things. He is the poet of the Indian *Divina Commedia* in which the love of Krishna and Radha symbolizes the love of God and the soul.

[1] Worshipers of Vishnu, the Preserver, the Life Force.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This love runs through all the phases of human passion, its dawn, its utterance, its secret tryst, its meeting, its parting, its final union.[1]

"Dark is the night and thick are the clouds,"

says Radha, the milkmaid.

"How could you, my beloved, come by the path in such a night?
There in the garden, I see him standing in the rain;
My heart breaks at the sight thereof."

And again:

"Thou art the lord of the Universe, O Krishna, adored by the Yogis.

"I am but a poor milkmaid and know not how to worship thee!

"Yet do I offer myself, my soul and my body, unto thee as the sacrifice of love.

"Thou art my lord, thou art my path, my mind seeks not for any other object.

"The world scorns me because of this love, yet do I not regret it.

"Abuse is like a garland of flowers about my neck for thy dear sake.

"Thou alone knowest whether I am pure or impure.

"Virtue and vice, says Chandidas, are alike to me. I know them not, but know thy feet alone."[2]

Allowing for the fact that we are comparing an accomplished but uninspired translation with a poetic one, it is evident that Mr. Tagore can trace some of his spiritual ancestry to Chandidas.

And of Chaitanya Devi, the "divine man," it is written:[3]

"When the God-vision possessed him he yielded to the fine frenzy of a poet and a lover. Whenever he would see the Kadamva flower blooming into beauty, freshened by the rains, he would fall into a trance, remembering that it was the favorite of Krishna. It was a beautiful sight to see him in fits of ecstasy. The tamal-tree, with its dark-blue foliage" (Krishna's complexion was dark blue) "created an illusion in him and he ran to embrace it."

[1] Mr. Dinesh Chandra Sen tells us that this is a form common to all the love-songs of the Vaishnava poets.—*History of Bengali Literature*, p. 123. Again "in Bhaktiratnakara we have 360 different kinds of the finer emotions of the lover's heart minutely classified" (!).—[2] *Ibid.*, p. 543.

[3] Translated by Mr. Dineash Chandra Sen: *History of Bengali Literature.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In fact, all these Vaishnava poets were in love, as Mr. Tagore is, with the world, with visible beauty as the living body of God. And they know the same rapture in abasement. In the songs of the later Vaishnavists Radha sings:

> "Take my bracelet away, O maids, the service of Krishna will adorn my hands, and I want no other ornaments for them;—take away my necklace of purest pearls, the thought of Krishna is the ornament of my breast; I want no other for it; the praise of Krishna will adorn my ears, no need of earrings for them. The ground trodden by Krishna's feet is dear to me; cover my body, O maidens, with the sacred dust of that ground."[1]

And the poet Govinda Das makes Radha say:

> "Let my body after death be reduced to the earth of those paths which will be touched by the beautiful feet of Krishna. Let it be melted into the water of the tank where Krishna bathes. When I have expired, let my spirit live as the luster of the mirror in which Krishna sees his face."[1]

And so on.

These passages at least show the sort of tradition that Mr. Tagore has behind him.

And this literature has still its hold upon the common heart of the people of Bengal. Again Mr. Dineash Chandra Sen tells[1] how once in Tippera he heard an illiterate Vaishnava devotee, an old man of seventy, singing that song of Chandidas which I have just quoted, "Dark is the night," and "playing on a lute made of a long gourd."

> "While the old man was singing, I suddenly heard his voice become choked with tears, and he could not proceed any more. On his coming to himself after this display of feeling, I asked him the cause of his tears. He said it was the song. The song, I said, described an ordinary love-affair, and where could be the pathos in it that gave occasion for such an outburst of feeling in an old man?
>
> "He explained to me that he did not consider it an ordinary love-song. Here is his interpretation:
>
> "'I am full of sins. My soul is covered with darkness. In deep distress I beckoned to Him to come to me. The merciful God came. I found him waiting for me at the gate of my house. . . .'"

Mr. Chandra Sen left him playing on his lute, weeping and crooning again and again, "Dark is the night." It is as

[1] Translated by Mr. Dineash Chandra Sen: *History of Bengali Literature.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if a rank-and-filer of the Salvation Army should be found singing and weeping over, not "Lead, Kindly Light," but St. John of the Cross: "The Dark Night of the Soul."

No wonder that Mr. Tagore appeals so strongly to the common heart of his people and that his songs are sung and *understood* in the villages of his province as well as in the churches of the Brama Somaj.

You would have said that with this long tradition behind him, with "three hundred and sixty different kinds of the finer emotions of a lover's heart minutely classified" by his predecessors it would be hopeless for a modern poet to find new language and new moods for their age-worn passion. But here again the love of God and the soul is exceedingly like the love of man and woman. Like human love it is a passion that the ages cannot wear, that is always startlingly new, divinely young, always a unique experience to the lover. And it is just because Mr. Tagore is a modern, a very modern poet that he brings to it such magic and such a marvelous variety of mood. He is himself too various to be bound by one tradition; and when he chooses he will sing of the utter absorption and extinction of the soul as gladly as he sang its triumphant nuptial-song. It is all in keeping. Even so, human passion desires utter extinction in the beloved.

> "I am like a remnant of cloud of autumn uselessly roaming in the sky, O my sun everlasting! Thy touch has not yet melted my vapor, making me one with thy light, and thus I count months and years separated from thee.
>
> "If it be thy wish and if this be thy play, then take this fleeting emptiness of mine, paint it with colors, gild it with gold, float it on the wanton wind and spread it in varied wonders.
>
> "And again, when it shall be thy wish to end this play at night, I shall melt and vanish away in the dark, as it may be in a smile of the white morning, in a coolness of purity transparent."

Here the self appears unmistakably as part of the illusion which is the play of Love.

Again he says:

> "I will deck thee with trophies, garlands of my defeat. It is never in my power to escape unconquered. . . .
>
> "From the blue sky an eye shall gaze down upon me and summon me in silence. Nothing will be left for me, nothing whatever, and utter death shall I receive at thy feet."

This mystic love knows all the sharp contrasts and an-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

titheses of passion; there is sternness and terror in its softness, and in its uttermost abasement a savage pride.

> "I thought I should ask of thee—but I dared not—the rose wreath thou hadst on thy neck. Thus I waited for the morning, when thou didst depart, to find a few fragments on the bed. And like a beggar I searched in the dawn only for a stray petal or two.
>
> "Ah me, what is it I find? What token left of thy love? It is no flower, no spices, no vase of perfumed water. It is thy mighty sword, flashing as a flame, heavy as a bolt of thunder. The young light of morning comes through the window and spreads itself upon thy bed. The morning bird twitters and asks, 'Woman, what hast thou got?' No, it is no flower, nor spices, nor vase of perfumed water—it is thy dreadful sword."

In his very austerity, his stoicism, there is the tenderness, the subtleness, the grace of the Vaishnavist, the adorer of life.

He has passages that recall Walt Whitman (that robust and boisterous Vaishnavist of the Western West) without his boisterousness. Like Whitman's his adoration of life is not greater than his adoration of death. "Because I love this life I know that I shall love death as well."

> "O thou the last fulfilment of life, Death, my death, come and whisper to me! Day after day have I kept watch for thee; for thee have I borne the pangs and joys of life."

And again:

> "When I go from hence let this be my parting word, that what I have seen is unsurpassable.
>
> "I have tasted of the hidden honey of this lotus that expands on the ocean of light, and thus am I blessed—let this be my parting word.
>
> "In this playhouse of infinite forms I have had my play and here have I caught sight of him that is formless.
>
> "My whole body and my limbs have thrilled with his touch who is beyond touch; and if the end comes here, let it come—let this be my parting word."

It is Whitman of the "Whispers of Heavenly Death," a Whitman exquisitely finished; chastened, refined out of all knowledge.

And these songs of the "Gitanjali" show only one side of him. He has written I do not know how many plays, tales, novels, prose essays, and innumerable love-songs, purely secular. There are songs of children which are in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cluded in the "Gitanjali," because they are not really secular at all.

> "When I bring to you colored toys, my child, I understand why there is such a play of colors on clouds, on water, and why flowers are painted in tints—when I give colored toys to you, my child.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "When I bring sweet things to your greedy hands I know why there is honey in the cup of the flower and why fruits are secretly filled with sweet juice—when I bring sweet things to your greedy hands.
>
> "When I kiss your face to make you smile, my darling, I surely understood what the pleasure is that streams from the sky in morning light, and what delight that is which the summer breeze brings to my body—when I kiss you to make you smile."

I should not have said that these song-offerings are "one side" of him. They are, rather, the outcome of his ultimate vision, the crown that he has set upon his life, his final sacrifice to the Unseen.

MAY SINCLAIR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POPULARITY IN LITERATURE

BY R. A. SCOTT-JAMES

If anything is worse than bad literature it is the tedious Pharisaism of the "man of culture." How flattering to the self-esteem to cast a supercilious eye upon the melodramatic, sentimental, unbeautiful books which constitute the mass of modern literature! The mass of modern literature is provided for the mass of men and women, but history has proved that a small and educated public may embrace stupidities not less desiccating than the stupidity of the million. A cultured public in the eighteenth century which could tolerate Colley Cibber gains nothing by comparison with an uncultured public which delights in Hall Caine. An author who attempted a poetic drama in the eighteenth century had to conform to the rules, but his compliance with convention is worth no more to literature than the libertinism of the modern reporter. The correct taste of that period is sufficiently flagellated in Swift's *Recipe to Make an Epic Poem,* wherein he "makes it manifest that epic poems may be made without genius, nay without learning or much reading. . . . It is easily brought about by him that has a genius, but the skill lies in doing it without one." To this day there exists an oligarchy of academic persons whose taste is almost exactly on a par with the taste most in evidence two hundred years ago. They are the people who estimate literature by its correctness rather than by its fineness or power, who are impregnable in their little fortress of pedantry, and are forever secure against the attacks of original genius.

If then we find that there is much in modern popular literature that we dislike, this is a very different thing from saying that we prefer the technical banalities dear to the pedant, or would set up the standard of a barren culture. The popular taste is something not to be scoffed at, but to be accounted for. To complain of it is wasted ef-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fort; to explain it would be something to the purpose. And this we can only do by keeping in mind that vital ideal which in spite of every setback the world has contrived to preserve, and endeavoring to discover what it is—short of that ideal, or remote from it—that the modern public wants: what taste it is that hundreds of modern authors are trying to satisfy.

It is evidently a very various taste, for it is the taste of the whole people. Every one in the modern civilized State has been taught to read, and almost every one has had the written word thrust upon him so that reading has become a habit. At every turn the eye falls upon the printed advertisement, the printed leaflet, the hand-written letter; and the habit which is developed by the necessities of life has intertwined itself also in the amenities. Newspapers, and weekly and monthly periodicals, adapt themselves to the tastes of every class in the community. The time is still far distant when books will be universally and systematically read, but the number of volumes annually distributed has increased at least tenfold in the last generation; and a large proportion of this literature must find its way to strata of society which fifty years ago read nothing at all.

It would be too much to expect that these millions of recruits to the reading public would be drawn to that literature which can be classed with the fine arts. One would no more expect them to admire it than one would expect a child of five to admire "Hamlet." The astonishing thing is, not that so few people appreciate the best literature, as that so many—*under direction*—are open to its influence, as we may see from the immense sales of those popular volumes which Mr. Ernest Rhys and others guarantee to be genuine "classics." Unfortunately in the case of recently written books Mr. Rhys is not always at hand. In such cases there is little direction for docile disciples of culture excepting such as is given in newspaper reviews, and reviews are as likely to misdirect and confuse as to encourage and guide.

But although this considerable and growing public of ambitious readers already exists, and may some day come to the support of original literature, it is at present easily swamped by that heterogeneous public for which the largest number of books are provided. That majority, in the nature of things, is unable to give the concentrated attention,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still less the selective appreciation, which literature of the higher order requires. There is nothing to encourage them to concentrate. The newspaper, the popular magazine, the theater, the moving-picture show, and the whole, shifting, rapid panorama of modern life discourage concentration. There are readers who can only give the odds and ends of their time to reading. Most of them are devoting the best efforts of their brain and attention to their business, household duties, their social and domestic affairs, and they turn to books only when their minds are fatigued and in need of repose. That is to say, they read not for a renewal of activity, but for distraction. With them, books satisfy the desire, not for an enhancement of life, but for the forgetting of it. Their literature is at the most a stimulant which excites without giving active play to their faculties; it presents nothing which connects with life or ideas, nothing even to call forth the effort demanded by their practical affairs.

There are others, for the most part women not of the working-class, who support with apparent earnestness the purveyors of popular fiction and biography, and even patronize poetry and genteel social philosophy. Among them are to be found those to whom the sterner actualities of life are unfamiliar and repugnant, for whom the practice of trifling with books is rather an ornament than an occupation, a mode of killing time rather than using it. They too read to be distracted, choosing an emasculate literature which panders to their essential dilettantism.

Now those who regard literature as an important thing, playing a significant part in the life of a nation, must clearly seek in it something more positive than a *distraction from* life; for them it must be an *addition to* life. It must provide experience compounded of the same stuff as other experiences; but not having the vividness which the direct impact of life carries with it, it must gain its vividness by an intensity, a fineness, an interest of its own—by a distinctive quality distilled into it from the personality of the writer. It is imagination which achieves this, the faculty so apprehensive of life that it can fashion life into images which are projections of the artist, his own stamp upon the stuff of life. To such an author literature cannot be a mere amusement or profession. It deals with what he conceives to be the most essential things in the world; it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his rendering of the world, his perspective; and it is just in so far as he has made this, his ideal and real world, appreciable also to us, that he has succeeded in his art. Such imaginative reconstruction of the facts of life, such impregnation of life with fineness, calls for alertness of faculty in the reader, demands from him something of that eagerness to perceive which characterizes the artist himself. But how can the tired worker seeking distraction, or the idle dilettante seeking only a drug or a stimulant, muster that alertness of faculty and that eagerness to perceive which are needed for the appreciation of art? It is not to be expected. A coarser appeal will produce all that such minds are able to assimilate. For good reading, like good writing, requires the energy of men not robbed of leisure, men who can enjoy some respite from the commonplace.

And yet it often happens, as we shall see, that those who have succeeded in distracting the many have put into their work some fineness which commends it also to the few. It is only in theory that there is a fixed boundary between works of art and the works which Philistines enjoy. In practice merit and demerit exist side by side; works crude in conception reveal a hundred finenesses, and works fine in conception reveal crudenesses of execution. And just as there are authors who mingle good and bad in their books, so too there are readers who enjoy certain kinds of excellence though they can be vulgarly excited by the cruder devices. And again there are persons who appreciate to some extent the most genuine works of art, who in moments of fatigue or jaded appetite can be diverted by the mere appeal to sensation.

The clever publisher knows well that the public for whose distraction he caters is divided into many classes, and that these classes must be attracted each in a special way. For the purposes of my argument I group these under five different heads, which are probably not exhaustive and certainly not mutually exclusive, but correspond, I think, to the five chief means of exciting and distracting the multitude. The two largest classes constantly overlap, consisting: firstly, of those whose love of sensation is satisfied by violent incident: and secondly, of those who are especially susceptible to the sentimental appeal. To a third class belong those who take pleasure in the agitations of sex feeling; and to a fourth, those whose sense of humor is tickled

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the sallies of the literary clown. The fifth class—a very large one—consists of those who are of a habit of mind to be excited by sensations which can be associated with religion and morality. It is useless to name as a sixth class those who are moved by intellectual ideas, for so small a class is not the objective of the popular author.

1. All novels must to some extent depend upon incident and arrangement of incident, but there is a kind of novel which only interests through excitement of events in their nature fictitious, even when accidentally true. Any really good book which may be spoken of as a " novel of incident " will invariably prove to be very much more. To take the case of Fielding's *Tom Jones,* one observes that it is an imitation of life which is neither a slavish copying nor a make-believe, but a vivid representation of eighteenth-century England as Fielding saw it; it is a book which presents characters, and itself has a character. Its atmosphere is quite unmistakable. It is not a " slice " out of the eighteenth century—there can be no real " slice out of life " excepting in life itself. It is Fielding's rendering of the eighteenth century, in particular it is his assertion of the *physicality* (if I may use the term) of life, a direct assertion of the boisterous physical vitality which as Fielding presents it and as Marlowe presented it, acquires value for the spirit and is acceptable to the imagination. It is the original pagan assertion of life, which finds its opposite in Euripides' conception of the ascetic Hippolytus; an assertion which Propertius repeated in the language of mockery when he speaks of a *lena* as

" Docta vel Hippolytum Veneri mollire negantem."

Even Euripides himself was so infected with the pagan view that he sees a sort of Nemesis pursuing the hero whom the slighted Aphrodite reproaches with lack of reverence —religious reverence — for her power. This primitive pagan view, crude, non-moral, but essentially sincere, animates the story of *Tom Jones* and gives it a character which is lacking in the popular " novel of incident."

Tom Jones was and is a popular book. But I hope I am not wronging the larger mass of mankind when I say that those (of the majority) who like Fielding do not like him for his unique excellences; they would be equally pleased if puppets instead of vital persons had passed along the same

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

course of exciting events; and that there are others who would not read him even if he began writing to-day, because his picture of life is too consistent with his imagination, and this very tenacity would perturb and irritate the trivial. Nevertheless he would have many readers among a large minority, just as Mr. Arnold Bennett has to-day—readers who can appreciate a story which is direct, vivid, and mainly external in treatment.

But the largest public is for writers like Mr. Cutliffe Hyne or Mr. William Le Queux. These more nearly represent the popular ideal in a novel of incident. For the former I have some respect. He shows ingenuity in his concoction of improbable plots. In *Captain Kettle* there is at least some attention to character—of a freakish kind—and something of atmosphere which gives it a mock romantic interest. It holds the multitude by reason of the thrilling sensations extracted from incidents wholly unlike anything possible in their lives, but near enough to reported facts to be able to astonish and excite them. Such improbable but ingeniously contrived events are enough to distract them, and if there be more in Mr. Hyne's stories imparted by his personal eagerness and honesty, it escapes them, or at least does not annoy them.

But this finer quality has been lacking in such of Mr. Le Queux's books as I have chanced to read. I may have been unlucky in my selection, and there may be admirable qualities in those of his novels which I have not read. But in the three or four volumes known to me I found that the persons were puppets, moving in unnatural situations, meeting sensational adventures which constituted all that there was of an improbable and slenderly connected plot. We all know the sort of book. But what is it that makes this and others like it popular? There were scenes of spurious passion. There were incidents in which action assumed the proportions of prodigy. There was vague sensation. In one of his novels I found an introduction by Lord Roberts warning Englishmen to prepare for the German invasion planned by Mr. Le Queux for 1910! History has not yet revealed the horror and devastation of that war; but this horror and devastation lent to Mr. Le Queux's book the interest which it required.

Yet the novel which is read mainly for the thrill of the incident may be written in a far finer spirit. Most his-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

torical novels depend mainly upon the vigor of the action. The very best historical novelists must be excepted; in Scott, for example, as in Fielding, there is so much which depends on character and atmosphere that there is always much more than thrilling incident to hold the attention. In the books of a modern writer like Mr. Ford Madox Hueffer, at his best, there is an artistry of composition, a synthetic quality in the romance, a unity of pictorial effect which give to them a quality of design and exquisiteness; they are a distillation of Mr. Hueffer's romantic personality. But if we consider Mr. Stanley Weyman, we are taking a novelist in whom everything depends upon the thrill of incident. Still, he has made of his work a fine craft. He uses words conscientiously. He has exceptional skill in tracing his ingenious plots. He has read history carefully, and for the most part adheres faithfully to facts—though I believe he is not so well instructed in German as in French history. The scrupulousness which refines his work gives quality to his narrative, and he can be read with pleasure by persons of exacting taste. And again, we might take the case of Richard Dehan, author of *The Dop Doctor*. That writer is not innocent of the crudest melodrama. She is diffuse, extravagant, formless. But she has imagined and created certain characters. She has at moments touched profoundly that most rudimentary of all emotions—the war emotion—an emotion which may be experienced intensely by every member of an energetic community, and therefore affords the basis of a real popular art—just as certain universal sentiments afforded the basis of folk-songs, which were constantly taken up and molded into fine artistic forms. *The Dop Doctor* is a book compounded of vulgar sensationalism on the one hand, and a strange imaginative vigor and actuality on the other.

But the sensibility of the crudest and, it is to be feared, the (at present) largest strata of society can be touched, as we have seen, by the sheer extravagance of the novel of incident, by action distorted out of the proportions of life and made astonishing, by violent assaults upon the reader calculated to arouse him like pistol-shots, since a more moderate appeal would escape his attention. Just as a donkey with a hard mouth can only be guided by violent jerks upon the reins, so a dull sensibility can only be awakened by the harshest literary appeal. Style in such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cases must adapt itself to the subject. Redundant words are heaped up where one would suffice for the trained intelligence. A multitude of violent, flamboyant phrases assist to the excitement of fever. It is possible, indeed, that some rudimentary art-feeling lurks behind this pandemonium of crude literature, more probably in cases where lawlessness is the result not of indolence, but of some sort of vigor and spontaneity. But it should be remembered that the mimetic impulses in which art among primitive races is supposed to originate are not themselves art; and continually to whet the appetite with such primitive exercises is to perpetuate the rudimentary condition and stifle the finer faculties.

2. The sentimental absurdities of Pyramus and Thisbe are the occasion of some apt criticism which Shakespeare puts into the mouths of Hippolyta and Theseus.

"HIPPOLYTA. This is the silliest stuff that e'er I heard.

"THESEUS. The best in this kind are but shadows; and the worst are no worse, if imagination amend them.

"HIPPOLYTA. It must be your imagination then, and not theirs."

Shakespeare is commenting on the sentimentality which is generally pleasing to Quince, Snug, Bottom, and the like. If he is mistaken it is in suggesting that this sickliness is confined to the company of carpenters and bellows-menders, and is not equally to be found among those of the high estate of Hermia, Helena, and Hippolyta herself. But it would never have done to admit so much before an audience of tinkers and tailors, splendidly patronized by a few young bloods of noble birth. Sentiment is distinguished from sentimentality precisely as Shakespeare suggests. The one is concerned with real emotions, the other with shadows. The first is informed by the imagination, the second is devoid of it, and is divorced alike from intellect and common sense. To touch the chord of sentiment justly and truly is one of the most difficult things in literature. Shakespeare himself by no means always succeeded. There is often an affectation in his lighter love-scenes which destroys the impression of sincerity. Even in life one may see how at any time the note of sentiment may be turned to absurdity by the least discordant element. The lover whose tender expressions are wholly pleasing to his lady may become an object of ridicule before an uninvited audience.

Sentiment is one of the every-day emotions, fine and light in its texture, requiring the tenderest and most delicate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treatment, and often it must pass off in laughter. It is something less than passion. It is not concerned with tragedies or crises, but the subtlest apprehensions of what comes and goes at every moment of life. It must never be treated as if it were passion, or the slender threads of which it consists will snap, and ridicule will justly reveal the unbalanced judgment of the sentimentalist. Nor must it ever be far from laughter, or it will collapse under its own strain, and we may be betrayed into thinking that the cynic is the best judge of life. It is the imagination exercising itself among things real, but not of the first order of importance. If you attribute to them that importance, you are guilty of false sentiment. The facts of life convict you.

See how delicately Charles Lamb could hold the balance in such an essay as "Dream Children"! Great-grandmother Field is just in her place, upright, graceful, and the best of dancers; and Alice's little right foot plays its involuntary movement in the nick of time; and when Uncle John died, the "children fell a-crying" at the narrative and asked about the mourning which they were wearing. It is all just important enough, just trivial enough, to carry its fragile burden of sentiment—so much, and no more. The charm is complete. Conceive what Dickens would have made of the story if he had been writing it! How sickly a fantasy of Paul Dombeys and Little Nells and garrulous "wild waves" he would have conjured up for *his* dream children! His dream children—the good ones at any rate—were little old people, monstrosities, freaks. Reality rejects monstrosities, and what reality rejects is no subject for literature (strictly speaking is no subject at all) save when, like goblins and fairies, it assumes the quasi-reality of fantasy and dreams.

I remember a story by a popular modern writer, Mr. E. Temple Thurston. It appeared in a volume entitled *Thirteen*. The author arranged his story with skill. He led up to his dénouement with admirable stage management. The story was about a little boy who understood that his father wanted a shop and fifty pounds to buy it with. This amiable child sallies forth from his poor quarter of the city and tramps to the distant regions where rich people live. Nothing doubting, he asks for fifty pounds. He receives sixpence. He exchanges it for a pair of braces and an insurance ticket. He drowns himself with exquisite delib-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eration and on the merits of his death and the insurance ticket the fifty pounds are forthcoming.

The defects of the story are obvious. The little boy has no proper place in this world, and his drowning, so far from being pathetic, was the best thing that could happen to him. For he was a freak, a monstrosity. Even those who may not accept this view must at least agree that he ought to have known better, and deserved a whipping rather than the reward of martyrdom and sentimental praise. But even if we assume that the boy is a possible creature, and that his act in begging for the money was beautiful and moving, we cannot escape the objection that the fatal ending is pitched in a discordant note of tragedy. The tragic conclusion is appropriate to a tale of passion, or to a tale which arouses a sense of the most urgent things in life. But to turn a slender sentiment into a thing of tragedy is to pass the limits of sentiment; it cannot carry the burden. The conclusion is not true enough to be even shocking. It is merely disgusting.

How is it that this mimicry of sentiment proves effective in moving the multitude, when the real thing so often fails to please? The answer, I think, is, that the artistic imagination can neither express itself through distorted objects, nor can it confuse in one blurred series of images the trivial and the urgent; its business being to see life with such sense of proportion as the concentrated artistic vision of the artist insures. But careless readers do not see objects until they are exaggerated out of resemblance to life; the adjustments of the artistic vision are too delicate to reach their perceptions. Mr. Thurston's little boy is seen to be very good, and to the sentimentalist his mere goodness is "beautiful." When he tramps across London his fatigue is sad, and the sadness of it is beautiful. When the rich gentleman gives him sixpence instead of fifty pounds, the reader sheds happy, thoughtless tears, and his beautiful death at the end is all that he requires as the final "assault upon his feelings." The phrase, of course, is Stevenson's, and it can hardly be avoided. Popularity rewards the writer who can *assault* the feelings of his readers, and any one who uses a more delicate method must be content with a smaller circle of readers.

It is in this manner, amiably enough, that Miss Ella Wheeler Wilcox can conquer America with sentimental

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poems, as Ian Maclaren once conquered England with sentimental stories. They touch us where the intellect and the common sense are in abeyance, and the moral sense is steeped in false sentiment. Thus it was that when a sort of torpor came upon the intellect and the common sense of Mr. A. C. Benson, he, who had been formerly a scholar and a friend of literature, became merely a sentimentalist. The author of *The Sick-abed Lady* (Eleanor Halliwell Abbott) is for the same reason esteemed as highly in America as the author of *Letters to My Son* is esteemed in England. The trowel is the instrument with which these honors—and these fortunes—are won.

3. It might seem that the popular literature of love ought to have been treated under the same head as that of sentimental literature. But it will become clear not only that there can be a popular erotic literature of a quite different order, but that I might have subdivided this class into two, one concerned with the popular literature of passion, the other with that of sensualism. There is, of course, a sentiment of love which is sufficiently considered in the last section. But I have made a distinction between sentiment and passion, which, for my view is important; and I must add the further and more obvious distinction between the love passion, which is an intense emotional experience affecting the imagination no less than the senses, and that sex feeling, which in essence is merely sensual. Leaving out of count, then, the "sentiment" of love, we have an obvious distinction between the literature which deals with the love passion and the literature which deals with sensual desires. But I do not propose any grandmotherly legislation which permits one subject to the artist and relegates the other to the pornographer. For it is clear that an author may deal well or ill with a subject intended to yield genuine passion (though in the latter case the popular interest will attach to the sensational character of the incidents rather than to the treatment of passion as such, and a book of this kind may be considered as I have already considered the "novel of incident"). And again, an author may deal well or ill with the sensations of sex; those sensations can provide material for fine art. It is a matter of treatment. Upon feelings of this sort Maupassant based some of his most felicitous stories. But Maupassant did not use sexual incidents for the sake of sex feeling; for him such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

incidents were various symbols, flickering images of life, incarnations of the brooding spirit of cynicism and scorn. We have already seen that to Fielding, for whom they were of less special significance on their own account, they were presented as assertions of boisterous physical eagerness, of delight in energetic life for its own sake.

It has already become obvious that the tendency of the most popular literature is to substitute the cruder sensations for the higher emotions and sentiments. We have seen how incident is liked for the mere sensation it can afford; how sentiment is turned into sentimentality. As a rule in discussing inferior literature the higher emotions need be taken little into account. But in the case of love it is different. The average man, by reason of his preoccupation and his averageness, is little affected by a variety of fine emotions; the hard facts of life smother them. But every one can observe that the emotion of love is not only an emotion to which most men at a certain age are susceptible, but that it seems to present itself, at some time or another, in a form finer than that of any other feeling entertained by average men. I believe that all observers would agree that innumerable men and women who cannot be touched in a subtle way by any other emotion (unless we except, especially in primitive men, the emotion of war; and then it is rather intense than subtle) can be and are so touched by the emotion of love.

Here then we might expect to find the basis for a literature which may be both widely popular and at the same time finely imagined. Within certain limits I believe the love passion does afford such a basis. If we can imagine an artist confining himself to this single issue, relying on no finenesses outside it, then we might have a work of art which men and women, representing in other respects any degree of imagination and dullness, might all almost equally enjoy. In practice it is seldom that an artist is content to confine himself so exclusively to this issue; it is not in the nature of the imaginative temperament to limit itself in this way. But I think we have an example approximating to the supposed type in Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights*. The strenuousness of the love emotion is in this book rendered with consummate power, and hence the hold it has over men of intelligence and over fools. But in almost every other respect the novel is sheer rhetoric and unshapeliness.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The novel (or popular biography) which deals not with the emotion of love, but the sex sensation, requires little discussion. If the object of the writer is to treat such a theme with imaginative criticism, well and good. If he intends only to reproduce the sensation, then it is obvious that we have reached the dregs of literature known as pornography.

4. It is extraordinary that there should be so little humorous literature distributed among the English-speaking peoples, for a sense of humor is a boon which has been allotted to a very large minority of the human race, and some sense of the ridiculous to the majority. It is through his sense of what is ridiculous in life, and his power of presenting it imaginatively, that Dickens seems to have acquired not only a permanent place in English literature, but a popularity quite unique among standard English novelists. The jocularity of Mark Twain is equally dexterous, but it is not so completely imagined as the humor of Dickens; it springs more often from situation than from character, and to that extent belongs more to the accidents than to the essentials of life. Mr. W. W. Jacobs deserves a higher place than is usually accorded to him in contemporary literature. His short stories are excellently contrived within their limits; the humor springs from situation and character conjoined. When a clever writer is content to confine himself primarily to the ridiculous in life, it is possible for him to make his effect both for the million and the exacting few. As *Wuthering Heights* was popular because it was little more than a brilliant presentation of the love passion, so *Many Cargoes* and *Light Freights* are popular as well as excellent because they aim at nothing but the broad effect of laughter. Mr. Jacobs is inferior to Dickens because he is a humorist and nothing more, and also because he has an infinitely narrower range. His art is one which presents but a single aspect of life, and suggests no ambition to exhibit a large grasp upon life as a whole. Nevertheless he has succeeded exactly in what he set out to do, and he affords us an example of an author who is both an artist and a novelist of vast popular repute.

But have any of Mr. Jacobs's books, or any of Dickens's, enjoyed greater popularity than fell to Mr. Jerome's *Three Men in a Boat?* In this book the humor sprang in no sense out of character; nor did it even spring out of situations

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contrived with especial skill. It consisted of a series of ludicrous impressions such as that of a man sitting on a pat of butter. Well, a man sitting on a pat of butter is a funny thing—when it happens naturally in life. But a collection of incidents, each of which might be funny if it happened among the accidents of life, are a poor source of entertainment when strung together without the life which makes them real. It should be remembered that what is an accident in life ceases to be an accident when it is invented in a story. A writer must needs supply from the imagination something which may give the artistic effect of accident. Even farce misses its true effects if it contains no verisimilitude. To see your friend sitting on a pat of butter is amusing; to listen to an invented account of besmeared garments is not amusing; for it misses the amusing point—which was the fact of its happening. But the admirers of *Three Men in a Boat* see only trousers and butter, trousers and butter; and they find nothing offensive in the manner in which this incongruity has been thrust upon their sight. Their complacent minds receive this funny visual impression because they do not perceive the glaring artifice which for another banishes the humor.

5. Morality among the Anglo-Saxon races is a popular theme. It can cover a multitude of artistic sins. Religion is popular in all countries, and is not always associated with good morals; but in England and the United States good religion and good morals fall under the same hierarchy. Both have their corresponding sensations and emotions. We may see them violently operative at revival meetings, distracting agents which are sometimes indeed so powerful as to lead to extraordinary reactions. It is difficult to attain the same violence with the written as with the spoken word, but if any living novelist has succeeded in attaining the effect of pandemonium through the use of religious and moral subjects, it is Miss Marie Corelli. As *proxime accessit* I might name Mr. Hall Caine. By the same methods Mr. Guy Thorne (*alias* Ranger Gull) attained, with the pulpit assistance of the Bishop of London, a sensational popular success in *When It Was Dark*. There have also been many fine writers who did not aim at spurious effects, but received praise by reason of their "moral tone" in circles where they would never have received it on the grounds of literary excellence. If George Eliot had not been a moralist

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she would not have been so popular in England and America. If Ruskin had not been primarily a preacher he could never have wielded his vast influence. Tennyson was beloved as much for his moralism as for his sweetness; and to-day so admirable a writer as Mr. John Galsworthy is even in "serious" circles regarded as a serious novelist mainly because he is a critic of morals. Mr. John Masefield wrote many novels and plays in which he showed singular fineness of feeling and beauty of style. But when he wrote an unbeautiful poem called "The Everlasting Mercy"—a story of thrilling incident with an admirable moral—lo! his popular reputation was made! People could understand a story of sensational incident. They could understand the moral. They flattered themselves that they were enjoying poetry.

. . . . . .

If any one should reproach me with adopting the tone of that odious thing, the "superior person," and should declare that I underestimate the intelligence and good sense of the majority of readers, my reply is that the finest literature is not that which is most read, and I am compelled to conclude that the finest ideas are not those which are most often embraced. To assert this is not to disparage the common sense and the practical intelligence of the mass of mankind. I believe that they are capable of vast activity and eagerness, much of which runs to waste through the fatigues of excessive labor, much, through lack of training and mental stimulus, can find no congenial outlet through the mysterious processes of art. The outlet which the majority of men find for their superfluous energy is not through the channel of fine ideas. Such literature as they read is for distraction and not for the vigorous use of their faculties. It cannot be otherwise. That is the condition imposed by the fragmentary education alone vouchsafed to the majority of men and women, giving them no more than that modicum of learning which is a dangerous thing. And it is a matter of supreme importance because this new reading habit of the million has turned the energies of authors and publishers from the few to the many. It has introduced into the literary profession a demagogic habit, and has set up a quantitative instead of a qualitative standard.

R. A. Scott-James.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOURCE OF PLEASURE IN FAMILIAR PLAYS

BY O. W. FIRKINS

WHY do we enjoy old plays? Why do we watch with pleasure the dramatic presentation of stories of which the issue and the chief events are foreseen from the outset?

Mr. William Archer, in his interesting book, *Play-making: A Manual of Craftsmanship,* draws a sharp distinction between curiosity which pursues the unknown and dramatic interest which "survives when curiosity is dead." In support of this thesis, he alleges several indisputable facts. He says, in substance, that a familiar play is full of unfamiliar points, that structure—craftsmanship—is most appreciated in repetition, that known characters, even known jokes, have the privileges and welcome of old friends, that "our pleasure consists of a delicate blending of surprise with realized anticipation," that we are capable of a vicarious curiosity dependent on the fiction of ignorance. The acting is supposed to be merely competent, and the field is thus cleared for the analysis of other elements.

On these clearly sound if not clearly original points another man might have been content to rest his case, but Mr. Archer has an argument in reserve, an argument for which he claims much weight and a qualified originality. It is in thus leaving his intrenchments and taking the field that he exposes himself to attack, and it is no more than just to present his idea in his own lucid and supple English. He is speaking of the screen scene in "The School for Scandal."

> "The greater part of our pleasure arises precisely from the fact that we know what Sir Peter and Charles do not know, or, in other words, that we have a clear vision of all the circumstances, relations, and implications of a certain conjuncture of affairs, in which two, at least, of the persons concerned are ignorantly and blindly moving toward issues of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which they do not dream. We are, in fact, in the position of superior intelligences contemplating, with miraculous clairvoyance, the stumblings and fumblings of poor blind mortals straying through the labyrinth of life. Our seat in the theater is like a throne on the Epicurean Olympus, whence we can view with perfect intelligence, but without participation or responsibility, the intricate reactions of human destiny."—Page 171.

An earlier utterance to the same purport is cited in a footnote (I quote in part only).

"Curiosity is the accidental relish of a single night, whereas the essential and abiding pleasure of the theater lies in foreknowledge. In relation to the characters in the drama, the audience are as gods looking before and after. Sitting in the theater we taste, for a moment, the glory of omniscience."—Pp. 171–2, note.

"The glory of omniscience" is a vivid phrase, and it is well perhaps to remind ourselves that, in the present context, omniscience means nothing more than the knowledge, at second hand, of possibly a dozen, possibly three or four dozen, facts bearing on a single fictitious transaction.

The theory appeals, at first sight, to our experience of human nature. The appetite and the credulity of vanity are enormous and indiscriminate; we derive pleasure from the smallest of our real superiorities, and likewise from the least plausible of those imaginary superiorities in which so many of our real inferiorities are comprised. But even our grounds or excuses for self-complacence have their limits, and I do not think that we plume ourselves in relation to our fellow-man except where we are entered in the same competitions, listed, in sporting parlance, for the same events. Thus I felicitate myself at the theater when I foresee an outcome or perceive a joke in advance of my fellow-auditors; this is natural enough, for we are all *ex officio* competitors in the race for enlightenment. Again, I love to see my superiority attested by the follies and fatuities of the laughing-stocks in comedy; I find in the drunkenness of Sir Toby Belch an embellishment of my own sobriety, in the ineptitudes of Sir Andrew Aguecheek an advertisement of my common sense. It is true that Sir Toby and Sir Andrew are, for anything I know, fictitious; but they purport to be copies of real originals, and Shakespeare, the actors, and myself are all in a conspiracy to pass them off as actualities. Viewed as such, they are in the same plane of opportunity with myself: they were free to follow their perverse instincts, or to take example by my temperance and wisdom.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The case is altered, however, when I pride myself on my superiority to Othello on the ground that I know his own story better than he does. How have I gained this superiority? I have seen the play, read the book, or been forewarned by some spectator or reader. Now in comparison with other persons who might have seen the play, read the book, or gossiped with their neighbors, and have proved derelict to all these opportunities (assuming knowledge of this kind to dignify its possessor), I am entitled no doubt to a genial self-complacency. But how is Othello himself to be brought within this category? The difficulty Othello must have had in reading or seeing or even discussing the play which bears his name is so manifest that, when I am asked to look down on him for his failure, even my vanity, which has never incurred the reproach of squeamishness, recoils from the crudity of the repast. In real life, indeed, a man who sees the whole of a situation of which others see only halves is justifiably elated; the others might have had the same wit or the same luck. But where knowledge is impossible, its absence ceases to be humiliating.

The principle may be stated thus: when a man compares himself with the effigies of men in imitative works of art, he gets no comfort out of superiorities arising solely out of his station as observer and their position as objects of regard. In a gallery of immovable statues a man never meditates gloatingly on his ownership of a pair of serviceable legs; before the silence of Titian's doges or Raphael's saints, he never exults in the activity of his larynx. The same thing applies to characters in history: a contemporary statesman—Mr. Asquith, for example—reading the biography of Lord Grey or Mr. Gladstone would not commend himself for superiorities of knowledge dependent solely on the elucidative influence of time; he would exult where he felt that he could have made better use of their data.

We not only revisit great plays with enthusiasm; we reread great novels with delight. The *rationale* of these two facts must be almost identical, and Mr. Archer's explanation, if valid, should be capable of transference from the play to the novel. Now I must confess my personal inability to carry over the idea of godship from the theater to the book; I can, with some difficulty, pursuant to Mr. Archer's flattering suggestion, imagine myself a god in the theater; I can take my seat for a throne in the same spirit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in which Falstaff took his "joined stool" for a "state" and his leaden dagger for a golden scepter; and the presence of real people in a removed precinct in a phase of life unrelated to my own existence gives color to the sense of apotheosis. But my throne is, both literally and metaphorically, fastened to the floor of the theater; I cannot take it home with me and survey the characters in *Jane Eyre,* or *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* or *The Rise of Silas Lapham* from its dignified, if somewhat straitened, eminence. The visual and tangible supports for Mr. Archer's Olympian metaphor, the apparatus of godship, so to speak, are withdrawn; and I find myself unable to sustain the metaphor in the absence of these reinforcements. When narrative is substituted for presentation, when the performance becomes entirely and manifestly subjective, I find myself incapable of rejoicing in the fact that I know more of a certain subject than certain other people who are obviously mere figments in my own mind. Yet the review of a great novel revives the original emotion quite as successfully as the return to a great play.

The instances of foreknowledge adduced by Mr. Archer are worth citing. "When Othello comes on the scene, radiant and confident in Desdemona's love, our knowledge of the fate awaiting him makes him a hundred times more interesting than could any mere curiosity as to what was about to happen. It is our prevision of Nora's exit at the end of the last act that lends its dramatic poignancy to the beginning of the first." No apter illustrations of the sound doctrine that foresight may heighten interest could be adduced; but surely literature could be raked from one end to the other without finding an instance more adverse than that of Othello to the theory that the interest of foresight is based on the pride of knowledge. With slightly lessened emphasis the same thing might be reaffirmed of Nora Helmer. The interest is sympathetic, not personal; and the knowledge humbles rather than exalts. Does the group outside the window in Maeterlinck's "*Intérieur*"—no bad symbols, by the way, of the forewarned audience in tragedy, in its sympathetic consciousness of the death of the girl of which no one as yet has ventured to apprise the peaceful family—does that group solace itself with the thought of its command of the situation?

Mr. Archer's Olympian theory is seen to be highly ques-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tionable, but the validity of his earlier arguments remains unaffected by the doubts that arise as to his supplementary hypothesis. Will not those earlier arguments suffice to explain the great and real pleasure we take in the revival of good plays? First of all, let us not exaggerate the stringencies of the problem. That a source of vivid and interesting emotion should be capable of eliciting vivid and interesting emotion on a second trial is no astonishing or anomalous fact; on the contrary, it is almost the rule. We do not drop a pear after the first mouthful, nor a jasmine after the first whiff; we swim or skate long after the novelty has vanished: we pace many times along a sea-beach or through a portico; we visit more than once a cataract or a campanile; we find yearly pleasure in what Lowell called "the familiar novelty" of spring, "none the less novel, when it arrives, because it is familiar." Why should moving sections of human life be less qualified than other things to please and stir us in the absence of curiosity? In point of fact, in our living individual experience, the review of past excitements, where curiosity in its primitive form is impossible, ranks high among the recreations and solaces of life.

A knowledge of the outcome is less inhibitory than people fancy. The news of a disaster or stroke of good-fortune often reaches us by the following gradations: a telegram, a letter, a personal colloquy. Does the telegram remove our wish to see the letter? Does the letter extinguish our desire for the interview? Why does a newspaper, so palpably and palpitantly anxious to cater to the suspense of its great infant, the public, never hesitate to let out its precious secret in the four or five words of an anticipatory head-line? Simply because, in poignant affairs, a knowledge of essentials does not remove, but on the contrary stimulates, an interest in details.

Between these cases and that of the revisited play, a difference, in theory at least, must be admitted; in the play the spectator not only knows the issue, but has already seen the particulars. But he has grasped them, or has grasped at them, hurriedly, casually, inadequately, under the strain of a violent and engrossing preoccupation with the outcome. Mr. Archer, in an altogether different context, speaks of the letter of which one takes in "the import, almost without reading the words." A moving drama might be compared to a momentous letter of which the first reading—the read-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing that tears the heart out of it—is careless because it is eager, and of which every syllable, almost every stroke, is sedulously conned on a second, more deliberate, perusal.

On the first night curiosity is paramount, to an extent which makes it hard to conceive that interest could survive the abstraction of this dominating factor. But the formula for the interest of the second night—assuming, for the sake of simplicity, that the visits are consecutive—is not simply: interest of the first night minus curiosity. It reads rather: interest of the first night minus curiosity plus interest (or, if you please, secondary curiosity) in a mass of detail passed by or half apprehended in the tension of the opening night. Let us figure to ourselves a group of associates dominated by a brilliant and copious talker; the observations of his companions in his presence might be merely casual and unimportant. But does it necessarily follow that, if the protagonist were called away, the ensuing conversation would sink to the incidental and trivial level of the previous forth-puttings of his interlocutors? Not in the least: the conversation of the leader had, probably enough, both stimulated and repressed the desire to speak in the minds of his associates; his withdrawal might be the signal for the emergence of new alacrities. In exactly the same way curiosity arouses secondary interests by the very conduct which precludes their immediate gratification; its recession is their opportunity. They are concerned in part with literary merits, more largely with craftsmanship, more largely still with emotional solicitations passed by or slurred over in the first eagerness of curiosity.

We pass to a group of facts illustrative of a further principle. A rustic surveys a country road with new eyes if he has once traced that road to its destination in the metropolis. A boatman watches the upper course of a stream with quickened interest if he has once followed its current to its far-off confluence with the ocean. A biologist studies the crude origins of life with heightened curiosity when he foresees their terminus in man. A boy reads with interest the commonplace opening chapters of a biography, because he knows these things to have issued in achievement. An older man reads of the humble folk-moots in Friesland or Sleswick (the head-waters of the mighty river as J. R. Green called them) or those battles of kites and crows which Milton contemptuously pushed aside with a patience sustained by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the distant but inspiring vision of a free commonwealth and a world-empire. These examples all point to the truth that a great known outcome irradiates all its antecedents, which, in turn, is part of the still wider principle that a great object glorifies its accessories. Admirable instances of the application of this truth to drama, particularly to tragedy, have been furnished by Mr. Archer himself in the references to "Othello" and "A Doll's House" quoted above; only Mr. Archer has attached to this undoubted truth a questionable theory of a satisfied thirst for omniscience on the part of a self-gratulating spectator. Our own list of examples of this anticipatory or retrospective interest—both adjectives, though formally contradictory, are in place—includes objects to which Mr. Archer's theory is clearly inapplicable—objects like a road or a river with regard to which the idea of a competition in knowledge with a triumphant spectator is unthinkable. The principle, however, can dispense with the theory.

The universal hatred of monotony is curiously qualified with a fondness for an ascertained order. Children insist on verbatim repetitions of the nursery tale, and resent the displacement of the humblest particular. The lover of good verse is scandalized by a misquotation. The slight variations in the Lord's Prayer shock ears to which they are unfamiliar. Every detail of a venerated ritual is anticipated and enjoyed by the pious. The recurrence in spring of the pasque-flowers, the Dutchman's-breeches, and the bloodroot in the same spot and the same order is a pleasure which variation would disturb. The verification of forecast in the visit to the old home is a delight that cheapens novelty. The fact that variety is the only means by which the frequent repetition of unattractive processes can be made tolerable is thoroughly consistent with the principle that where objects are agreeable and repetitions rare perfect correspondence is the desideratum. Mr. Archer himself speaks aptly of the "delicate blending of surprise and realized anticipation" in the familiar play. The punctual arrival of each situation, each outcry, each jest, each metaphor, at the specified and anticipated time, the checking up of one's remembered goods and chattels, the sureness with which the immitigable Shakespeare or Ibsen or Bernard Shaw brings these wilful actors and evasive managers to time, the delightful certainty with which these caprices and vagaries

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and insurgencies evolve to the foreseen and wished-for end —these things create a pleasure which unites in its fashion the charms of ordered plan and opportune coincidence.

The sum of the pleasures above cited might seem a sufficient compensation for the withdrawal of curiosity. But is it necessary to suppose that curiosity is inoperative even in a familiar play? An "acute critic" quoted by Mr. Archer thinks that curiosity of a sort may be aroused in the informed spectator through his self-identification with "the discovering persons on the stage." It seems clear that another sort of vicarious curiosity is aroused in the foreseeing spectator by his self-identification with the discovering persons in the audience. To many persons it would scarcely seem extravagant to go a step further and concede even his identification with his old self—the self that first saw or read the drama.

The contradiction between curiosity and foreknowledge as logical concepts does not apply with anything like the same force to curiosity and foreknowledge as psychological states. Logically, we cannot want to know what we do know, but the end of human nature would seem to be the discomfiture of logic. The mental tension we call curiosity is not necessarily or normally the sequel of a careful investigation and precise ascertainment of the state of our knowledge. It is an instinctive response to certain signs or symptoms of uncertainty or incompleteness in objects or actions. The justness or soundness of these intimations, the actuality, in other words, of the uncertainty or incompleteness they suggest, is a matter that we cannot always stop to determine before yielding our minds to the spell of curiosity. Now when, in real life, we see men wooing or quarreling or cheating or conspiring—the kind of actions which the stage habitually reflects—we assume that what is unsettled is uncertain. We do not stop to test this assumption. Its validity is so nearly universal that a test is superfluous. What, then, naturally occurs when the stage presents us with an action with all those marks of incompleteness which in real life justify the unhesitating assumption that the result is unknown and that curiosity is warranted? We accept the suggestion, and the tension appears in automatic response to the accustomed provocations.

But we do know the issue, avers the objector. True: but this knowledge of the outcome, though, in one sense, a per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manent possession of the mind, is by no means a permanent occupant of consciousness. Its emergences are normally few, and, between its emergences, it is inoperative. The thought of the end will come to us in a familiar play, but its staying with us is another matter. A mind preoccupied with an engrossing spectacle cannot be expected to occupy itself in rectifying the impressions of that spectacle by perpetual recourse to a counteractive, disillusioning, and therefore for the time being, unpalatable fact lurking somewhere in the outskirts of consciousness. My memory knows that Mercutio is slain by Tybalt. But how is my memory to get credence or even audience for its impertinent allegations when my eyes and ears are dominated by a brisk interchange of thrust and counterstroke upon the stage, absorbing in its interest and obviously undecided? When I have found out whether he is slain by Tybalt, I shall have leisure to remember that I knew it beforehand.

In the theater where so much illusion is current, why should we chaffer over the illusion of uncertainty? If we can assume toward unreal things the attitude appropriate to reality, why cannot we assume toward known things the attitude appropriate to ignorance?

We see, then, that in a broad survey of life what has once affected us strongly usually has the power to affect us strongly again; we see that the satisfaction of the leading or initial curiosity is the needed occasion and signal for the emergence of strong secondary interests; that in many phases of life and literature alike the knowledge of a great outcome is an incalculable reinforcement of our interest in preliminaries: that a definite order becomes itself the object of a strong, even an exigent and jealous, affection; that, if we use our prerogative as human beings to throw over logic and resort to psychology, curiosity is found to co-exist with knowledge. In the light of these considerations, all of which are briefly stated or indicated by Mr. Archer himself, it hardly seems necessary to climb Olympus with that distinguished critic—alluring as such a journey would undoubtedly be with such companionship—to obtain a point of view from which the interest in known plays becomes intelligible.

O. W. Firkins.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

BY FRANK B. NOYES,
PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

PROBABLY no institution is more widely known by name than The Associated Press and, on the other hand, more vaguely understood by the public generally as to its organization and its functions. For whatever cause this may be, that it is a fact is daily apparent.

The Associated Press is an association of something over eight hundred and fifty newspapers, operating under a charter of the State of New York as a mutual and co-operative organization for the interchange and collection of news. Under the terms of its charter "the corporation is not to make a profit nor to make or declare dividends and is not to engage in the business of selling intelligence nor traffic in the same."

In other words, The Associated Press is simply a common agent of its members by which they arrange an interchange of the news that each collects, and is bound by its membership obligation to contribute for the common use of its fellow-members and also as the agency through which reports of foreign and certain classes of domestic happenings are collected and distributed to the newspapers served by the organization.

The fact that in the present year we celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the first nation-wide co-operative and non-profit-making news-gathering organization in the world seems to make the publication of something respecting it timely.

The Associated Press is in no wise the master of the newspapers constituting its membership; it is distinctly their servant.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Its Board of Directors is composed of active newspaper men chosen at annual meetings by the membership and, in an experience running through twenty years of intimate connection with the present organization and also that of the older Illinois corporation, I have never known an instance in all the changing personnel of Boards of Directors when there was any departure from the most rigid observance of the highest obligations of trusteeship and disregard of private and selfish interests. The President, Vice-Presidents, and members of the Board of Directors serve without salaries.

The Associated Press of to-day is the outcome of a many-year struggle between two opposing systems. One, that of news-gathering concerns with private or limited ownership which dealt at arm's-length with newspapers to which they sold news at such profit as might be secured, and over which the newspapers who bought from them had no more control than over the paper-mill supplying them with print paper.

The other system is based on the theory that a powerful, privately owned and controlled news-gathering agency is a menace to the press and people.

Determined to establish an agency subject only to the control of the newspapers for whom it acted, in 1893 a group of Western men composing the Western Associated Press began a fight to attain this end, and since that time a contest between these two opposing principles has been waged. In asserting that The Associated Press, as to-day constituted, is the servant and agent only of the newspapers for which it acts, I have no thought of minimizing the tremendous importance of the work it does as such an agent, but wish simply to emphasize the thought that properly speaking it has no entity of its own, no mission save to serve its members.

Its members are scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Canada to the Gulf, and represent every possible shade of political belief, religious faith, and economic sympathy. It is obvious that The Associated Press can have no partisan nor factional bias, no religious affiliation, no capitalistic nor pro-labor trend.

Its function is simply to furnish its members with a truthful, clean, comprehensive, non-partisan—and this in its broadest sense—report of the news of the world as ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peditiously as is compatible with accuracy and as economically as possible.

To do this the newspapers composing its membership contribute first, the news of their localities and second, weekly assessments of money aggregating about $3,000,000 per annum, with which an extensive system of leased wires is maintained (22,000 miles of wire in the daytime and 28,000 miles of wire at night), bureaus in the principal American cities supplementing and collating the news of local newspapers and bureaus for the original collection of news throughout the world.

The volume of the news report to members varies greatly, ranging from five hundred words daily by telegraph or telephone to papers able to utilize but a small amount of general news matter, to more than fifty thousand words daily or thirty-five newspaper columns in the more important cities.

The method of collecting foreign news has been greatly changed in recent years. Formerly The Associated Press collected its foreign service in London, receiving the news there of the Reuter Company, of the Wolff Agency of Germany, and of the Havas Agency of France with smaller affiliated agencies in Italy and Spain.

The objection to this method was that the news as received in London was alleged to be impressed with an English bias—in any event it was concededly not collected from an American viewpoint.

To meet this criticism The Associated Press has established regular bureaus of its own in all the great news centers, and now maintains offices and staffs in London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, St. Petersburg, Vienna, Tokio, Peking, Mexico City, and Havana, in addition to hundreds of individual correspondents scattered throughout the world.

It is probable that in the foreign news field the extraordinary genius of Melville E. Stone, the General Manager of The Associated Press, has been most strikingly exhibited. Just prior to the Russo-Japanese War Mr. Stone secured from the Czar of Russia the abolition of the censorship, and newspaper men still remember the remarkable frankness with which the Russian Government gave out the news of Russia's reverses in that conflict.

Orders expediting the messages of The Associated Press were issued at his instance by the German, French, Italian,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Russian Governments, and as a result it has come to be common for European capitals to get the first news of Continental events through Associated Press reports cabled back from New York.

One beneficial result coming from this more direct relationship is to be found in the minimizing of the ill effect of the occasional outbreak of some utterly inconsequential German, French, English, or Japanese "yellow" sporadically abusing the United States and its people.

Formerly profound significance of a wide-spread hostility was attached to such outpourings. With the closer understanding that comes from more intimate knowledge, we now understand the relative importance of the newspapers of other countries as we are able to weigh and grade our own.

The disadvantage of lack of news touch is strikingly apparent in the relations of the United States with the Central and South American nations. These countries secure their news of the United States by way of Europe, and it consists mainly of murders, lynchings, and embezzlements. The antipathy to the United States by the people of these countries is undoubtedly largely due to the false perspective given by their newspapers. If in truth we were the kind of people they are led to believe we are they would be fully justified in their attitude.

It has been the aim of those intrusted with the management of The Associated Press to secure as its representatives both at home and abroad men of high character and attainments, and it may, I think, be fairly assumed that the reputation for accuracy and fairness that its service enjoys is largely to be attributed to an unusual measure of success in this endeavor.

While The Associated Press is generally held in good esteem, I would not be understood as indicating that it has been exempt from criticism and attack.

If in a campaign all the candidates, or their managers or press agents did not accuse The Associated Press of the grossest partisanship as against the particular candidacy in which they were interested, those bearing the responsibilities of the service would feel convinced that something was radically wrong and would look with suspicion on the report themselves.

This is but human nature. During the last campaign for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Presidential nominations every candidate either in person or by proxy expressed his conviction that The Associated Press was favorable to somebody else.

Mr. Wilson's press agent asserted that our service was pro-Clark, and in the opinion of Speaker Clark we had sold out to the Wilson people. Mr. Taft's managers felt that he was not being given a fair show and Mr. Roosevelt was firm in his conviction that the avenues of information had been choked to his disadvantage.

Of course later we know that Mr. Wilson does not share the only-for-publication views of his press agent and Speaker Clark is as emphatic in his withdrawal as in his hasty charges. Mr. Taft's managers realize that The Associated Press cannot report speeches that he does not make, and Mr. Roosevelt must see a humorous side to the suggestion that any one has interfered with his getting a fairly adequate representation on the first page.

With all this, however, goes a fundamental misunderstanding of the functions of The Associated Press. The individual correspondent or reporter for a given newspaper or a small group of newspapers having a common bias may be permitted to indulge in partisanship or in propaganda.

This is absolutely not to be permitted in The Associated Press. No bias of any sort can be allowed. Our function is to supply our members with news, not views; with news as it happens—not as we may want it to happen. Intensely as its management may sympathize with any movement, no propaganda in its behalf can be tolerated. Very jealously indeed does the membership guard against their agency going outside its allotted duties and argus-eyed is the censorship of every handler of our "copy."

It is not, naturally, to be claimed that no mistakes are made. They are made and will be made. But in the very nature of the business, with the heart so worn upon the sleeve, detection very swiftly follows, and the mistakes are few and far between.

The desire to enlist The Associated Press in propaganda or advocacy is usually to be found at the bottom of criticisms of its service. Added to this often is misinformation as to the real facts and sometimes, though happily rarely, actual malice.

The service from Russia, for example, has been harshly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

criticized by some who thought that the province of The Associated Press was to undertake a crusade against the Russian Government because of its anti-Semitic attitude. Our theory of our obligations is that we should report the facts as they occur, without fear or favor, but that it is no part of our duty to draw indictments save as the facts alone are damning.

The case of the Koreans charged with a plot to assassinate Governor-General Terauchi has recently been much discussed.

These Koreans were almost all converted Christians and the American missionaries in Korea were naturally intensely interested in the matter.

It was freely alleged that The Associated Press, unduly influenced by the Japanese Government, had suppressed the fact that these Koreans had made confessions, implicating American missionaries as accessories to the plot, and had subsequently retracted these confessions, asserting that they had been extorted by atrocious torture inflicted by the Japanese police the intimation being also that the missionaries were in peril by reason of the repudiated confessions.

Based on this some of the missionary authorities here became much perturbed, and indeed one of the great New York papers printed news and editorial articles criticizing The Associated Press for the suppression of the matter.

As a matter of fact an inspection of the news service received by The Associated Press and distributed to its members showed that it carried the full facts; the confessions, the implications of the missionaries, the allegations of torture, the fact that the allegation of torture was believed by the missionaries, and also the fact that the Japanese denied the torture stories and attached no credence whatever to the prisoners' statements implicating the missionaries.

On learning the real situation the New York newspaper in question promptly printed an ample *amende honorable,* but I do not doubt that many still ignorant of the retraction feel that The Associated Press was guilty of some dereliction.

Another cause of frequent misapprehension is in the general tendency of newspaper readers to attribute anything seen in print to The Associated Press, and it is constantly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessary to explain that some violently partisan or inaccurate article was the work of a " special " and not a part of our service.

Away back in the middle of the last century an alliance, offensive and defensive, existed between the old New York Associated Press, a news-selling organization owned by seven New York papers, and the Western Union Telegraph Company under the terms of which the New York Associated Press dealt solely with the Western Union and the Western Union in turn gave discriminating rates and advantages to the New York Associated Press.

Although this arrangement (in the light of to-day a very improper one) was abolished more than thirty years ago, many people think that it still exists and occasionally some one arises fiercely to denounce this unholy alliance.

The simple truth is that The Associated Press has during all these thirty years and more paid exactly what other news associations pay, and that the rates charged by the telegraph companies for the facilities furnished us are greatly in excess of those charged individual newspapers and still more than those charged stockholders having leased wires.

The Associated Press leases wires, many thousands of miles of them, from the Western Union, the Postal, the American Telegraph and Telephone Company, and from several of the independent telephone companies.

The first three have a common basic rate, charging us $24 a mile a year in the daytime and $12 a mile a year at night. For exactly the same wire they charge an individual newspaper $20 and $10, respectively, and a stockbroker gets a still further reduction.

Far from receiving discriminatory favors, The Associated Press feels that it is being distinctly and heavily discriminated against.

In these days when all transactions on a large scale are being subjected to so rigid a scrutiny it is natural that so conspicuous a mark of public attention as is The Associated Press should not find itself immune from critical inspection.

From time to time some voice is raised denouncing The Associated Press in the same breath both as a monopoly and because it is not a monopoly, and insisting that it become a monopoly by admitting to its membership all desiring its service; the theory being that in some way the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

activities of the association impress it with a public use and subject it to the obligation of a common carrier to serve all comers.

From an ethical standpoint only, then, is there anything improper, unsafe, or unwise in a group of newspapers, large or small, associating themselves together to do a thing that each must otherwise do separately and of reserving to themselves the right to determine to what extent the membership of such a group shall be enlarged?

It does not seem possible to hold fairly that a newspaper in New York may not join with one in Chicago and one in Philadelphia to maintain a common correspondent in Washington without making it obligatory on these three newspapers to share the fruits of their enterprise with other New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia newspapers.

If in addition they arrange that each shall supply the others with the news of its home city, is it within the bounds of reason that they are required to furnish to competitors the same facilities?

I give this illustration because that is exactly the relation of the newspapers composing The Associated Press—the scale only being enlarged.

The obligations of a common carrier are, however, in no wise dependent on the magnitude of its transactions. The ferry sculled across a stream is just as much impressed with a public use as is the Pennsylvania Railroad. Each is a common carrier. It is the nature of the transaction and not its size that determines its obligations. As respects the question of common carriership, what is right for three to do is proper for three hundred or for eight hundred to do.

To compel The Associated Press to assume an entity of its own and to serve all comers would, in my judgment, bring about a condition fraught with the gravest dangers to the freedom of the press and in turn to the freedom of the people.

At present about one-third of the daily newspapers of the country are represented by membership in The Associated Press.

There are a number of concerns engaged in the collection and sale of general news to non-members of The Associated Press, and in one way or another they supply their customers with what are declared to be satisfactory services.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In no wise desiring to become anything approaching a monopoly, The Associated Press has avoided even the appearance of any competitive price rivalry, admitting additional members solely on the ground of a common benefit to the members of a co-operative institution.

If by some occult reasoning The Associated Press could be held as a common carrier, these news-selling organizations would be wiped out and The Associated Press would, if the end sought for was accomplished, become a real monopoly and the incentive for co-operation no longer existing, it would naturally drift into a concern for pecuniary profit, in private ownership and subject to private control.

No more dangerous situation can well be imagined than the passing of the control of the greatest news-gathering and news-disseminating agency of the world from the hands of co-operating newspapers to the control of some individual interested in manipulating the news—the master and not the servant of the newspapers.

Because this danger would be so grave it will not come, but for another reason also, a very basic reason.

There can be no monopoly in news.

The day that it becomes apparent that a monopoly in collecting and distributing news exists, that day, in some way, by some method individual newspapers or groups of newspapers will take up the work of establishing a service for themselves, independent of outside control.

The news of the world is open to him who will go for it. Any one willing to expend the energy, the time, and the money to approach it may dip from the well of truth.

The news service of The Associated Press does not consist of its leased wires or its offices. Its soul is in the personal service of human men, of men with eyes to see, with ears to hear, with hands to write, and with brains to understand, of men who are proud when they succeed, humiliated when they fail and resentful when maligned. The telegraph wires are but the blind instruments of this service, though the wire has brought the uttermost parts of the world marvelously close. These human entities are ranging the world to send word of its doings, of its rejoicings, and its sorrowings to satisfy the thirst of the people for intelligence of the march of events.

The news service of The Associated Press of the horror

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Martinique was not the event itself. It was the personal service of a man who at the first hint of the disaster that had wiped out a population took his orders, chartered a boat, and went to Martinique, where no correspondent still lived, and sent a story, *his* story of the great tragedy, wrecking his health by the effort required.

To get this report, this "news," was open to any one.

To get it cost the members of The Associated Press more than $30,000 in addition to the human wastage and prodigious effort.

It was a part of the day's work.

And as to-day devoted men labor and die in order that the members of The Associated Press, an organization that neither owns nor prints a newspaper, may lay before their readers a fair picture of the world's happenings, so always will these and other men serve nobly and die bravely that the world may have tidings of sport and festival, of birth and death, of Congress and Parliament, of battle and plague, of shipwreck and rescue.

FRANK B. NOYES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR AND ITS HIDDEN CAUSES. By EMILE OLLIVIER. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1913.

THE detailed history of a great event as written by a man who helped mold it may be as fascinating to the general reader as it is useful to the specialist in history. Microscopic in detail such a history no doubt must be, by comparison with the history of a nation stretching over ages; but in reality it shows men and events in a proportion best adapted to the naked eye. Viewed in ordinary human perspective, facts and men become alive; things philosophical become things vital.

It is only in a work of this sort that we enjoy the luxury of reading a narrative vibrating with real, not imaginary, interests and emotions, having as its plot no novelist's design, but a world-shaking intrigue.

Of course, it was not primarily for our amusement that M. Emile Ollivier wrote *The Franco-Prussian War and Its Hidden Causes:* he designed it to set historic transactions in a true light and to justify his conduct as the head of Louis Napoleon's so-called Liberal Ministry, which bore the responsibility alike of the effort to secure peace with honor and of the apparently inevitable war. But he has written a narrative that interests us independently of any desire to determine verdicts or to settle mooted points for all time.

He has written, indeed, with a French clearness and a French vivacity, admirably preserved in the English translation—with a passion for accuracy and a passion for justice that awaken a fine quality of interest and predispose the reader in his favor.

The *Leitmotif* of the narrative is Bismarck's alleged determination, as a means of securing German unification, to force France into a war by seating a Hohenzollern prince upon the throne of Spain. Point by point, through complicated negotiations, characterizing, criticizing, always according credit where credit seems due, M. Ollivier enforces his views with Demosthenic clearness. His story has an appeal which the defense of a moderate policy may pre-eminently deserve, but seldom achieves.

Is the "principle of nationalities" fundamentally so sacred as M. Ollivier believes? Was the war made inevitable by Bismarck's "slap in the face" or was it inevitable for deeper reasons? These are questions in which the book does not really concern us. Personally M. Ollivier believes that between France and Germany there was no such difference of civilization or of destiny as would sooner or later have necessitated war.

However that may be, *The Franco-Prussian War and Its Hidden*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Causes is wonderfully clear and complete in its setting forth of individual facts and causes. Its lucid definition of opinions, its unequivocal statements as to facts and views, give it value alike to the student of history and to the general reader. Free from the vanity of personal memoirs, it shows individual traits as active forces, revealing the anxieties, hopes, ambitions, of men engaged in world-affairs.

THE PERSONALITY OF NAPOLEON. By J. HOLLAND ROSE. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1913.

Necessarily quite different in the quality of its interest is *The Personality of Napoleon,* by J. Holland Rose, reader in modern history to the University of Cambridge. The book, embodying the Lowell Lectures of 1912, pictures Napoleon in eight phases—as Man, as Jacobin, Warrior, Lawgiver, Emperor, Thinker, World Ruler, Exile. "The statement of a subject is adequate if it is made clear so far as the subject-matter permits." This remark of Aristotle's quoted by the author in connection with his sixth chapter applies in a measure to his whole work. Not, of course, a detailed history of Napoleon's career, the book ventures little into theory or speculation upon motives, but traces causes as well as human causes can commonly be traced. The personality of Napoleon, so far as his resemblance to other men makes him comprehensible, stands out from the multiplicity of facts more clearly than we might have expected. Putting together the phases of his character as analyzed, we get a picture not photographic, but evidently true. Over the difficulties of subject and method—the necessity of summarizing, of weighing, and judging so elusive a thing as personality—the author measurably triumphs by virtue of a scholarly incisiveness, a sanity of emphasis, and a really eloquent style. What did Napoleon accomplish which a man of other personality might have done differently? It is through its effects that we may best judge character, rather than by analysis which ends in adjectives. "As Emperor he subjected France to a mental rest-cure and a strenuous training for the muscles. The change was not unlike that which happens to nervous, over-taught youth fresh from the lycée and perhaps prone to anarchism, when they come under the drill-sergeant for a year or more." In passages like this the advantage of the writer's point of view and his effectiveness in availing himself of it are obvious.

THE GOVERNMENTS OF EUROPE. By FREDERIC AUSTIN OGG. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913.

History is a record of evolution, and more and more it is felt that a knowledge of how the evolutionary process has proceeded in the past may help to further and guide it in the future. More and more the progress that seemed accidental and instinctive becomes conscious and calculated. But the change from the kind of progress that is the result of compromise between opposing forces to that which is the result of far-seeing design is necessarily slow, and in the study of government especially we understand little unless we understand how present systems developed in response to human needs, and how a multitude of things

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that have no theoretic reason for existence have nevertheless a real reason. In facilitating the historical and comparative study of government, Frederic Austin Ogg's *The Governments of Europe* — a book intended primarily as a text-book, but not baffling to the general reader—will prove widely useful. In treatment the work is condensed yet thorough. The discussion of the English constitution begins with the Anglo-Saxon kingship, and ends with the present status of the suffrage question. In the case of each government the historic sketch is confined to the points most useful to the student, expanding or contracting according to the needs of the theme. A brief section deals with German constitutional history prior to 1848, and the author soon passes to the formation of the empire and its consequences. The account of the governmental development of France begins with the Revolution. Always the historic view is made an integral part of the explanation of present governments and their workings. In this manner the volume discusses the governments of Italy, Switzerland, Austria-Hungary, the Low Countries, Scandinavia, and the Iberian states. Covering so wide a field and dealing with so great a body of facts, the treatise achieves effectiveness only through unusual clearness of aim and an admirable sense of proportion. Yet few works are more genuinely informing than such a one as this, when it is really, as in the present case, what it professes to be.

THE HAPPY WARRIOR. By A. S. M. HUTCHINSON. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1913.

It is of the manner that we are compelled to think first of all in reading A. S. M. Hutchinson's romance, *The Happy Warrior,* and this is almost a pity; just as we feel it a pity that in a story which owes its charm to essential truth of character and sentiment our attention should in the end be drawn too forcibly to a somewhat crude device of plot.

With respect to plot *The Happy Warrior* is in much the same case as Henry Sydnor Harrison's deservedly successful romance, *Queed,* which it surpasses in finish, though not in genuineness. To be sure, mystery does not, as in *Queed,* haunt us through the closing chapters of the story, a naïve specter of which nobody is afraid. But at the last we are unfortunately reminded that we have been reading a *novel,* a thing of calculation and premeditation, obeying material laws of structure—reminded, for throughout the greater part of the narrative we remain under the spell of a delightful illusion.

But it is of the manner that we think first. Mr. Hutchinson sets off in a tricksy style. There are humor and philosophy in his opening discourse upon the element of hazard in human affairs, as illustrated by the story of a dog which bit a vicar and the surprising consequences that flowed from this injudicious and uncalled-for act. In this there is a not disagreeable flavor of the mock-epic. But the effect of it is to make us a little uneasy. Can it be possible, we ask ourselves, that the man will undertake to write a whole novel in this fashion? To write in a certain predetermined style, to express everything with graceful artificiality, to attain unity of effect in a difficult manner—all this is merely a matter of ingenuity, of virtuosity. And we do not want virtuosity; we are athirst for something real.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Hutchinson's style continues to be tricksy. It continues to present matters with unexpected detail, with unexpected repetition, with unlooked-for brevity, with what seem like strange contortions of the point of view. But it wins upon us. Increasingly it makes us feel that we are receiving the something real that we demand; that we are taking it in, moreover, with quite extraordinary ease and pleasure.

Throughout, *The Happy Warrior* is written in a style which provokes criticism and baffles it. We surrender to the charm, and at the same time we want to know the secret. How explain the success of this style, with which we can find no fault except that it makes us feel how intolerable it would be if in the slightest degree it failed of its intended effect?

The question is not to be answered by detailed analysis. It soon becomes evident, however, that the manner of the story is not an affectation. Nor is it, perhaps, wholly spontaneous. There is method in it—or at least it has all the advantage of deliberate method. Taking originally a somewhat playful attitude toward his theme—an attitude that makes humor easy, that lends itself readily to the portrayal of little grotesqueries of speech and behavior, the author is surprisingly free to produce what effect upon us he pleases, as if a half-playful, half-philosophic, altogether sympathetic view of human life were the fundamental key, from which he modulates with the greatest ease into pathos, into poetry, into idyllic description, into realistic action. So that he is peculiarly unhampered by that stupid tendency of language to become a law to itself, making a writer, as we so often feel, express himself in a manner more heavily impressive, more laboriously facetious, than of his own will he intended.

From the bondage of plot Mr. Hutchinson escapes with less success; yet it is a high tribute to his art that we forget the obviously romantic plot in the subtle humanity of the characters—always except at the last, when the romantic plot, after the manner of its kind, arises and smites us in the face.

The framework is conventional. The youthful Lord Burdon secretly marries a girl of class beneath his own, discovers the fatal mistake not of the marriage, but of the secrecy, is in an agony of indecision; at last, seeking a way out, goes on a military expedition to India, and meets death in battle. The title falls to the Lethams, distant relatives. The new Lady Burdon is selfish, ambitious in a bourgeois fashion, lacking in nobility. Audrey, the young widow, about to become a mother, unaware that the Lethams are now in possession of title and estate, goes, in accordance with her husband's last instructions, to throw herself upon the kindness of his grandmother. The new Lady Burdon meets her, is panic-stricken, sees her hopes crumbling. Affecting to disbelieve Audrey's story, she dismisses her with disdain, steeling her heart, like a bourgeois Lady Macbeth. Audrey dies of the child which is born to her, and her sister Maggie, loving helplessly, hating bitterly, plots revenge on the Lethams. Audrey's child, Percival—the Happy Warrior—is the real heir of the Burdons—he, and not the Lethams' sickly son, Rollo. In due time, when revenge has thoroughly matured, when fate gives the signal, Maggie will strike down Lady Burdon as Lady Burdon struck down Audrey; for she has the necessary weapon—proof of the marriage. A romantic plot, surely, of the old-fashioned sort, even to the element of old-fashioned hate, so seldom met with in stories nowadays.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What the author makes of it is extraordinary. He makes it genuinely human, genuinely poetic. His style, responsive and flexible, poises and rushes on in the manner of real thought, real talk, real gesture, following the pulse of interest that people feel in what they are doing or saying at the moment. We feel the throb of Mrs. Letham's excitement when news comes of the death that makes her Lady Burdon. We get in brief the full quality of her husband's stupid honesty, his kindly simplicity. With relatively few words Mr. Hutchinson comes as close to life as such writers as De Morgan—or at least persuades us that he does so—producing even the effect of leisure in a rapid narrative.

Then turning back to describe the courtship of Audrey, he makes the episode both humanly credible and poetic. In the treatment of young love, followed by tragedy, he transcends the requirements of the plot, and in this part of the story there is a touch of universal pathos.

Percival's boyhood, his friendship with Rollo, the dawning of his love for the girl predestined to be Rollo's wife—all this is true and refreshing: and the thing that has to be done—the suggestion that Percival is by nature and instinct the true Burdon—is done well. It is surprising that we like Dora—Percival's "Snow-White-Rose-Red"—even though she is obviously cold, obviously superficial, obviously selfish. And we have no ill feeling toward her even when at the crisis she yields to her mother's wishes, acquiesces in separation from Percival, accepts Rollo for no better reason than that she "always was to." Indeed, this affair of snow-white, rose-red passion would lose something of its charm and its dramatic fitness if it were more a matter of reasonable choice, less a matter of youth and beauty and instinct.

Between the period of boyhood—"the happy, happy time"—and the crisis, occurs an adventurous episode successful in its way, adequate in its picturesqueness and interest, yet somehow not of a piece with the rest of the story. The picturesque reality of this part of the narrative seems not equal to the sentimental reality of the other parts. Percival, rebelling against the idleness of his life, bound somehow to make himself a man for Dora's sake, becomes a professional boxer. His old friend the gipsy Japhra, who gives exhibitions of boxing at fairs and circuses, receives him as one of his novices. Japhra's poetical and practical philosophy, his exaltation of spirit over flesh, in a way expresses the intimate theme of the story, and expresses it eloquently. His daughter Ima, who loves Percival with an instinct truer than his love for Dora, is surely not without her appeal. Yet about Japhra there is an effect of calculated quaintness, about Ima a hint of calculated pathos. And then the implied exaltation of the manly art!—a sentiment to which we respond, yet belonging to a different category from the sentiment that inspires the tale as a whole. Nevertheless, Percival's fight with "Foxy Pinsent" is a great fight, described with rare art. Japhra's ring talk, indeed, can hardly fail to strike us as a little strange: "He hath no bowels for punishment. There is a coward streak in him—I have seen it. . . . He will use his tongue on thee, mocking thee." But if this, by way of contrast, sets us to thinking inopportunely of the "sporting page," it is probably our own fault.

As for the crisis, it comes to pass in this way: Among Percival's acquaintances is a servant of the Lethams, one Ecbert Hunt—a somewhat

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

morose, grotesquely grumbling sort of person whom one does not take too seriously. Ecbert hardly seems the sort to commit a murderous assault; yet that is just what he does. In an affray of the circus people he stabs the boss, who has previously struck and cursed him. Brought to trial, Hunt is not helped by the testimony of Lady Burdon, and is convicted. On the same night on which Percival, having learned at last that he is the true Lord Burdon, goes out into the open to fight his great fight for the mastery of his soul, the convict breaks jail. The two meet, and in the struggle to prevent Hunt from carrying out his mad purpose of taking vengeance on the Burdon family by murdering Rollo, the Happy Warrior is killed.

The element of chance—even of incongruous chance—is no doubt, as the author insists, a *vera causa;* yet this seems hardly to excuse the consummation of a tragedy through a character who has seemed from the first little other than mildly comic. But, after all, the blemish is not serious. The story succeeds, plot and all. The tragic ending is a happy ending, not inconsistent with the spirit of a tale which now and then in pure joyousness bubbles into irrepressible farce.

Sentimental romance without the plot—the quality, when it is fine enough, without the machinery, as in such tales as *Eben Holden*—that is what we would like. But that is often, no doubt, an impossible, a self-contradictory desire: and we are really grateful for *The Happy Warrior.*

THE DRIFT OF ROMANTICISM. VIII. SHELBURNE ESSAYS. By PAUL ELMER MORE. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1913.

Frankly disclaiming "the way of sympathy" in criticism, Paul Elmer More rightly insists in the preface to *The Drift of Romanticism,* the eighth volume of the "Shelburne Essays," that there is room for the kind of criticism "which is not so much directed to the individual thing as to its relation with other things, and to its place as cause or effect in a whole group of tendencies." The writers whom Mr. More discusses are so diverse that they seem to have been chosen deliberately as having nothing in common save their relation to the romantic movement. They are William Beckford, Cardinal Newman, Walter Pater, Fiona Macleod, Nietzsche, and Huxley.

Criticism of any depth implies a philosophy, and in criticizing the views—especially the implied views—of writers who themselves assume to be critics of life, the need of a clear philosophical conception is peculiarly felt. If the thinkers whom Mr. More has selected as illustrating the drift of romanticism are not all philosophers, they all, at least, possess the power of coloring our views of the whole of life. In each there is something that we must accept as the law and the prophets or else deny altogether. To say nothing of the philosophers, we cannot read the romanticists worshipfully, or with anything like full assent, and remain unchanged. To read them assentingly, without full understanding of their implied doctrines is to tamper with our souls. Thus an unsympathetic analysis of the appeal made by such writers as Walter Pater and Fiona Macleod turns out to be no mere critical vandalism, and in general the severity of Mr. More's method is fully justified. Its difficulty is obvious. The supercritic (if the term may be used without Nietzschean

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

significance) must get upon alien ground in order that he may survey in its entirety a whole province of thought and feeling. And it is incumbent upon him, also, to define the ground upon which he stands. For if the romantic writer may leave his fundamental conceptions in a not unattractive obscurity, so must not the critic. His is a duty not merely of analysis, but of self-expression.

Few writers upon literary subjects have so fully set forth their reasons for the faith that is in them as has Mr. More in *The Drift of Romanticism*. With uncommon frankness he has described his own cosmos. In a chapter which, although modestly placed at the end of the volume, the reader would do well to peruse first, he has summed up his philosophical views—not argumentatively, but in a series of definitions, for his object is not to establish a philosophical system, but simply to disclose with the utmost clarity the premises of his critical opinions. The creed here concisely set forth is dualism—a creed that is irreconcilably at war with every romantic scheme of things. Briefly, dualism recognizes two elements of man's consciousness—an incessant flux of desires and impressions, and an "inner check which displays itself intermittently as an inhibition upon this or that impulse." Beyond these two elements self-knowledge cannot penetrate; but unwillingness to recognize the dualism of our nature—inexplicable as that dualism may seem—leads only to intellectual error and emotional unrest. The characteristic of romanticism, according to this philosophy, is that it ignores the inner control in man and the apparent counterpart of that control in nature—glorifying, instead, those emotions which have to do merely with the flux. The attractiveness of this tendency, and its danger, lie in its arrogation to itself of a spiritual validity. Thus men think and write of desire, of the thirst for experience, even of passion, with the fervor of religious mystics. Conversely, to the romanticist the infinite presents itself as a means of escape from control, offering to the intensely egoistic personality an indefinite enlargement of emotions and desires. To the dualist, on the other hand, the infinite seems the very principle of order or control, manifesting itself, indeed, in no other direct way than by the limitation of desires and impulses.

Mr. More's views of the particular authors of whom he treats may be inferred in a general way from his philosophical creed. The essay on William Beckford describes the vagaries of a romantic soul, while *Vathek* supplies a symbolic picture of romanticism itself. "If we look below the surface of things, and penetrate many illusions, we shall perceive in Beckford's vision [at the close of *Vathek*] of the restless throng, moving ever with hand pressed upon flaming heart, the essential type and image of the romantic life and literature." Again, Newman's "inability to find peace without the assurance of a personal God answering to the clamor of his desires is but another aspect of that illusion of the soul which has lost its vision of the true infinite and seeks a substitute in the limitless expansion of the emotions." The same tendency underlies the refined estheticism of Pater. He too had "lost from his soul this vision of the infinite, and sought to deify in its place the intense realization of the flux itself as the end of life." As for the writings of Fiona Macleod, their essential quality is not Gaelic, but romantic. In their spirit there is really nothing new, and despite their illusory gleams of beauty they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

signify nothing beyond the impulse of the heart impatient of the constraint imposed by science and scientific philosophy to seek peace "through surrender to an impressionism that acknowledges no law of control."

Continuing, Mr. More applies his philosophical touchstone to a philosopher and to a scientist. Nietzsche is found to express merely "the clamor of romantic egoism turned into horror at its own vacuity"; and in the essay on Huxley the progress of the romantic movement is traced until it is seen actually to blend with the scientific philosophy of our own day, accounting, or helping to account, for such tendencies as educational laxity, the spirit of *laisses faire* in politics, the philosophy of Bergson, pragmatism, and even syndicalism.

It is impossible, within a brief space, to give more than a faint and incomplete sketch of Mr. More's views, with something of the color of his thought. Quotation and summary can do scant justice to the firm outlines of his ideas or to the solidity and grace of his style. To many minds his book will bring that peculiarly intimate sense of conviction which seems to flow from an immediate recognition of soundness and sanity. If any are inclined to quarrel with his philosophy as dogmatic, they cannot, at any rate, fail to value his uncommon sincerity and clearness of thought. *The Drift of Romanticism* is a profound book, but not an obscure one; it is suggestive without being irresponsible.

THE IMMIGRANT INVASION. By FRANK JULIAN WARNE, Ph.D. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1913.

Dualism is essentially the philosophy of common sense, giving to life the value and meaning which men instinctively attach to it. And, whatever may be the drift of philosophy and imaginative literature, it seems that we may observe in books dealing with practical problems a tendency that runs counter to romanticism. In other words, such books exhibit in an increasing degree common sense as opposed to the kind of hypothesis and assumption of which Mr. More complains so bitterly in connection with scientific philosophy. People are in general much less impressed with the sacredness of theory than they were fifty or a hundred years ago; there is a more general respect for balanced judgment based upon facts. In political and social discussions nowadays we hear rather less of conflicting principles, rather more of simple right and wrong. Instead of taking it for granted on *a priori* grounds that our institutions are the best possible, we inquire more and more carefully into their actual workings.

As Frank Julian Warne, Ph.D., points out in his book, *The Immigrant Invasion,* there can be no settlement of the question regarding the restriction of immigration so long as the contention lies between the humanitarianism that considers only the welfare of the immigrant and the possibly narrower humanitarianism which looks chiefly to the welfare of the native-born. The facts supporting both mental attitudes must be admitted. Immigration does certainly benefit the foreigner, but no less certainly does the importation of cheap labor lower the standard of living among natives and imperil institutions which a relatively high standard of living alone makes possible. Dr. Warne discusses the history of im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

migration to this country in considerable detail, contrasting the past with the present as to the amount and kind of the foreign influx. He holds that the issue of the Civil War was largely determined by the excess of desirable immigration to the North as compared with the South, which the immigrant avoided for reasons connected with the institution of slavery. But now that the period of territorial expansion is at an end, unrestricted immigration tends to the establishment of an industrial servitude potentially as evil as slavery itself. The causes and effects of immigration are in a general way familiar, but Dr. Warne, after years of investigation, has brought forth an array of fresh facts. His pages bristle with statistics, yet his book is truly readable; for we constantly meet either interesting and authoritative confirmation of what is generally regarded as true, or, not infrequently, hitherto unconsidered aspects of the immigration problem. In his statement of the fundamental problem he fully admits the right of employers to buy labor in the cheapest market; but over against this right he sets the inevitable damage which our civilization must suffer from the lowering of the standard of living among the laboring classes. In his detailed discussion he draws inferences impartially from the facts. In the end he reaches a conclusion favoring the restriction of immigration—a conclusion that comes not as the demonstration of a preconceived thesis, but simply as the inevitable outcome of the evidence. Throughout, the book is characterized by common sense, moderation, balanced judgment.

SYNDICALISM, INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM, AND SOCIALISM. By JOHN SPARGO. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1913.

Something of the same impartial and catholic spirit is to be found in John Spargo's *Syndicalism, Industrial Unionism, and Socialism.* Here again common sense, taking due cognizance of both sides of a question, without looking for an impossible theoretic solution, weighs facts and reaches conclusions obviously sound as far as they go. The book is written avowedly from the standpoint of a Socialist, and its chief defect for the general reader lies in the persistence of the author's purpose to discriminate Marxian Socialism from Syndicalism. Mr. Spargo gives us rather more quotation from Socialist party declarations and from the opinions of Socialist writers than those of us who are not of his faith will find entirely profitable. His discussion of Socialist policy is by no means devoid of interest, but to the reader in search of general enlightenment such discussion is not of prime importance. It is to be remembered, however, that to Mr. Spargo as a Socialist, Syndicalism is, in a peculiar sense, a grave issue. It involves those principles which he holds dearest, and, being obviously a sincere thinker, he discusses the theory and tactics of the new movement with a seriousness and concern that lead to clearness and in general to sanity. No one could well give a more perspicuous and informing account of the meaning, methods, and tendency of Syndicalism. Of course Mr. Spargo believes heartily in the inevitableness of the class war, though he distinguishes frankly between fact and opinion. To most of us there will seem an odd perversion in the point of view which permits approval of "sabotage" as ethical, and bases hostility to the method on the purely pragmatic ground of its ultimate effect. "I am

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not opposed to sabotage," writes Mr. Spargo, "because of any love of 'law and order' or because of any regard for the 'rights of property.' None of these things is particularly sacred to me; none of them is one-thousandth part as dear to me as the emancipation of my class." Yet his demonstration of the inherent weakness of Syndicalism, as demoralizing the workers themselves and unfitting them for the very destiny contemplated in the philosophy of their movement, is both effective and illuminating. In the end his attitude amounts to much the same thing as ethical disapproval of the policy of doing evil that good may come.

OF SIX MEDIEVAL WOMEN. By ALICE KEMP-WELCH. London: Macmillan & Co., Limited, 1913.

Of such books as Alice Kemp-Welch's *Of Six Medieval Women,* it is a little difficult to determine the purpose, romantic or otherwise. The book is mildly feminist in spirit, but seems to depend for its interest chiefly upon the fascination which some readers find in the process of evoking from the past an entirely shadowy personality. As a matter of fact it appears that there is a plentiful lack of material out of which to construct character sketches of representative medieval women. Apart from its pseudo-biographical tone, the book is pleasantly written, and it is not lacking in interest of a kind. But from the chapter upon Roswitha the Nun we get little except medieval religious romance; from that upon Marie de France, little beyond medieval courtly romance. From the chapter upon Mechthild of Magdeburg we get rather more than is agreeable of medieval mysticism. In the account of Mahaut, Countess of Artois, there is more substance, and we learn a little of a medieval woman's manner of life. The character and career of Christine de Pisan seem almost to emerge from the medieval mists; but Agnes Sorel is little more than a name clustering with conjectures, and in general from medieval records we can derive little save one or another form of medievalism. The statement of facts in regard to all these women seems careful, yet the facts are much colored with sentiment. Peculiarly unprofitable seem such speculations as would connect the dramas of Roswitha with those of Shakespeare, and often the author seems to yield somewhat to the natural tendency to exaggerate the importance or dignity of her subject. At the end of the volume is a chapter about medieval gardens containing food for the imagination and some curious facts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED